

Domestic Event Support Operations (DESO)

Andrew Smith

**Center for Technology and National Security Policy
National Defense University**

February 2012

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE FEB 2012		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2012 to 00-00-2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Domestic Event Support Operations (DESO)				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, 300 Fifth Avenue, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC, 20319				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 55	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the National Defense University, Department of Defense, U.S. Government, Australian Defence Force, or Australian Government. All information and sources for this paper were drawn from unclassified materials.

ANDREW SMITH is a Brigadier in the Australian Army. He is currently assigned as the Director of the Combined Planning Group within the Headquarters of U.S. Central Command. In that capacity, he directs a team of international officers from 30 countries in the preparation of strategic-level political-military analyses and assessments. As a regular military officer with more than 30 years of experience, Brigadier Smith has commanded Army units and formations up to the brigade level. He has extensive experience in military support to domestic events, including raising and commanding a specialist unit for security support to the Sydney 2000 Games. Subsequently, he commanded the Joint Task Forces that supported the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games and the 2007 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Leaders Meeting. His other operational tours include service in Iraq in 2004. In a staff capacity, he has extensive experience in the force development field. He has also served as an instructor at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Brigadier Smith's research interests include institutional responses to unconventional security threats and weapons law; he has published papers on those subjects. Brigadier Smith holds a B.A. with Honours in English, a Master of Defence Studies, and a Ph.D. in Politics.

CONTENTS

Domestic Event Support Operations (DESO)	1
Background	2
Characteristics.....	3
A Framework for Defense Support to Domestic Events	4
Events Requiring Defense Support.....	4
Key Considerations	6
Principles.....	8
Types of Support.....	9
Other Considerations	11
Recommended Planning Checklist	13
Conclusion	14
Appendix 1: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Operation GOLD)	15
Appendix 2: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the 2002 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Operation GUARDIAN II)	36
Appendix 3: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games (Operation ACOLYTE)	40
Bibliography	46
Abbreviations and Acronyms	51

DOMESTIC EVENT SUPPORT OPERATIONS (DESO)

Periodically, governments across the world find themselves hosting major peacetime events, often of an international nature, on their sovereign territory. Examples of these events include international sporting and cultural activities, such as the Olympic Games, the Soccer World Cup, and international expositions; and political gatherings, such as the G8 summit and World Trade Organization meetings. For a number of reasons, the successful conduct of these events is a matter of considerable national importance. To ensure the international community experiences these events at the appropriate standard, governments are inclined to support them even if, technically, they are not themselves conducting them. Frequently, the resources needed to achieve that standard exceed those available to the domestic authorities normally responsible for such events. This lack of resources creates a need for governments to surge briefly to higher levels of capability. To do so cost effectively, governments may need to engage the full range of national public and private sector agencies and capabilities, including their national defense establishments (DE),¹ to support the major peacetime domestic events their countries host. For the purposes of this paper, the defense activities associated with that support are termed “domestic event support operations” (DESO).

DESO differ from other forms of support that DEs provide in the domestic environment in that they relate to major preplanned activities that arise with significant notice.² In this way, DESO differ from the urgent “reactive” tasks through which militaries often support dangerous and unpredictable domestic security requirements, such as counterterrorism (CT). DESO can also include non-security or “general” support but are different from other forms of non-security defense assistance to civilian communities (such as humanitarian assistance for disaster relief) in that they are often associated with highly newsworthy international events with major national reputation implications. As a result, DESO usually attract both a high government priority and a major public profile.

Although most militaries do not consider DESO “core business,” DESO are an historical reality. Military involvement can be significant, and the complexities of military activities in any nation’s domestic environment demand that DESO be well planned and organized. In a time of constrained national security spending, such as that predicted for most countries in the coming decade, and heightened security concern stemming from the current violent extremism phenomenon, DESO planning requires a robust intellectual framework. This paper seeks to contribute to the development of such a framework by characterizing DESO and offering an organizational model for such operations. It concludes with a recommended “checklist” for DESO planning.

The paper draws heavily on Australian experience in the last dozen years, during which time the country hosted a Summer Olympics and Paralympics (Sydney, 2000), a Commonwealth Games (Melbourne, 2006), an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Leaders Meeting (Sydney, 2007), and a number of other events, all of which required DESO to be mounted. In

¹ This paper uses the term “defense establishment” to refer to the entire state defense apparatus, both military and civilian. It includes all of those things normally controlled by a Department or Ministry of Defense, including aspects that are not exclusively military, such as facilities, acquisition, and science and technology. References to the uniformed military forces will generally use the generic term “military” as a noun.

² For example, Domestic Event Support Operations (DESO) differ from what the U.S. Army and Marine Corps refer to as “Domestic Support Operations.” The associated doctrine recognizes four categories of such support, which do not encompass the support to domestic events considered here. FM 100-19/FMFM 7-10, *Domestic Support Operations*, Headquarters Department of the Army/U.S. Marine Corps, 1993, available http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/service_pubs/fm100_19.pdf, viewed August 14, 2011.

addition to the author's experience in some of those operations, the paper also draws on his research for his 2007 Ph.D. thesis.³

BACKGROUND

In many countries, examples of DEs supporting the civilian community and civilian authorities in “non-military” events date as far back as the 19th century. DESO in their modern form, however, seem to date from the 1950s. Australia's case is illustrative, with events that have involved DESO including—

- The 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games
- The Brisbane 1982 Commonwealth Games
- Expo '88 (Brisbane)
- The Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Operation GOLD)
- The 2001 and 2002 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings (CHOGM) (Operations GUARDIAN I and II)
- The 2003 Rugby World Cup (Operation SCRUMMAGE)
- The 2003 visits of U.S. President Bush and Chinese President Hu (Operation MIATA)
- The 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games (Operation ACOLYTE)
- The 2007 Sydney APEC Leaders Meeting (Operation DELUGE)
- The 2008 World Youth Day, Sydney (Operation TESTAMENT)
- CHOGM 2011, Perth (Operation AMULET)
- The 2011 visit of U.S. President Obama (Operation NORWICH).

The above list also reflects the more recent tendency, in Western militaries, to conduct DESO as “named” operations commanded centrally by a higher joint command structure. Recent practice also demonstrates a tendency to form Joint Task Forces (JTF) or similar temporary, tactical groupings to organize and command the military forces involved. DESO may also be occurring more frequently since 2000. Because major international events promise significant economic benefits, cities around the world will probably continue to compete hard for the privilege of hosting them; therefore, the need for DESO will likely continue.

The security requirements of major international events have increased steadily since the 1972 Munich Olympic Games. This trend accelerated during the 1990s with the emergence of a threat of “mass casualty terrorism.” This threat led to the introduction, by 2000, of requirements for measures to protect against new threats, such as chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) weapons and agents.⁴

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the security requirements of international events have increased again. New security capabilities have been added to the suite of traditional ones, leading to a heightened security dimension in DESO. Military security

³ The author raised the Joint Incident Response Unit (JIRU), a specialist unit that provided domestic security support to the Sydney 2000 Games. He commanded the unit during the Games. Subsequently, he commanded the Australian Joint Task Forces (JTF) supporting the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games and the Sydney 2007 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum Leaders Meeting. His Ph.D. thesis, accepted in 2007 by the University of New South Wales (NSW), dealt with the factors affecting the employment of the Australian Defence Organisation in homeland security roles since September 11, 2001.

⁴ The chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) evolution seems to have been stimulated by the attempted use of sarin by the Aum Shinrikyo sect in attacks on the Tokyo subway system in 1995 (along with other, less well-known chemical and biological weapons initiatives of that group).

support now includes “high-end” capabilities, such as fighter aircraft for defensive counter-air (DCA) measures and naval vessels for maritime CT. To demonstrate the various types of DESO, this paper contains three appendices with case studies on the Australian Defence Organisation’s (ADO) support to the Sydney 2000 Games (Operation GOLD), 2002 CHOGM (Operation GUARDIAN II), and Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games (Operation ACOLYTE).

CHARACTERISTICS

DESO have the following characteristics:

- **Known Time and Location.** Because they are associated with preplanned events, normally the location and timing of DESO are known well in advance. For example, the host city of an Olympic Games is usually announced about 7 years before the event. This degree of strategic warning enables detailed planning, early force design, and timely force assignment, which in turn provide considerable scope for the use of low-readiness forces, especially military Reserve forces. In practice, however, the predictability of DESO often leads to late tasking because of their relatively low urgency compared to core business military tasks, such as foreign security crises. As a result, planning staffs must aggressively pursue operational preparation objectives.
- **Civil Primacy.** The events that involve DESO are essentially civilian activities occurring within the host nations’ domestic environments. Although the precise allocation of domestic responsibilities, authorities, and jurisdictions differs from nation to nation, in most countries, civilian agencies have responsibility for and jurisdiction over domestic affairs, including security and law enforcement. Major domestic events place demands on civilian agencies that exceed their normal capacity, requiring them to surge to higher levels of capability in certain areas. Defense support is usually associated with assisting civilian agencies in achieving this surge. As a result, military forces will almost always support civil agencies in DESO. DESO are therefore subject to civil primacy in terms of both the conduct of the events themselves and the security support provided to them. In countries organized on a federal constitutional model, domestic security may be a civil function that is further devolved to state, provincial, or local levels, while “defense” (and hence military forces) is a federal (national) government responsibility. This organization may introduce a further jurisdictional complication. The national DE’s provision of security support must therefore address jurisdictional issues. Differences in the capabilities of various state/provincial and municipal jurisdictions, especially in relation to security matters, may mean that the demand for DE surge support can vary among host jurisdictions, with some requiring more support than others. This variation can be significant for events conducted across a number of locations within a country.⁵
- **Lack of Standing Forces.** Because DESO do not constitute core business for the military, standing forces optimized for important DESO tasks generally are not maintained. Although standing forces may include some capabilities that are relevant to DESO tasks, such as Special Forces CT units and improvised explosive device disposal (IEDD) teams, usually these require varying degrees of special preparation to adapt them ideally to DESO. It may also be necessary to create some specialized

⁵ For example, an Olympics or a major international sporting event (such as the Soccer World Cup) may involve fixtures in several cities of the same country. An Olympics is always preceded by an international Torch Relay, which touches many countries around the world and, usually, every corner of the host country.

capabilities specifically for each DESO. As a result, DESO forces tend to be *ad hoc*. Careful planning and timely force establishment are needed to generate adequate forces. This requirement is complicated during periods of high operational tempo, when DESO must compete with other national priorities (such as overseas operations) for access to necessary forces.

- **Reliance on Domestic Infrastructure.** Because they usually occur within urban areas, DESO rely heavily on existing civil and defense infrastructure—particularly facilities and communications and information systems. This infrastructure is not optimized for support to security operations and, in urban areas, is often scarce. Existing infrastructure may require timely adaptation to ensure its suitability for DESO. Because of the temporary nature of such requirements, however, local defense agencies often resist relinquishing facilities or committing resources for DESO purposes. As a result, resolution of DESO infrastructure requirements usually occurs late and requires considerable staff effort.
- **Expectations of Performance.** Normally, the military does not play a prominent role in most nations' domestic environments, but both governments and the public have high expectations that their armed forces (the "public face" and symbol of the DE) will perform any task to a high standard, especially in a crisis. These expectations will exist regardless of the DE's attempts to limit its involvement in DESO.⁶ Failure to perform in accordance with expectations could be highly damaging to the military's reputation and its relationship with both the government and the public. It is therefore imperative that all DESO tasks are properly resourced and adequate contingency plans exist to cover the unexpected. As the operational phase of a DESO approaches, the military's strategic posture should be reviewed and adjusted as necessary to ensure success.
- **Urban Environment.** DESO normally occur in or near a major city. As a result, associated activity has high public visibility. The DE's profile must be carefully controlled to maintain a favorable public image. This requirement applies especially to the military; it is vital to ensure the military's visible presence does not detract from the delivery of the associated event, especially if it is of a peaceful nature (such as a sporting event or cultural carnival). This places a premium on discipline—adequate military police resources are needed to monitor the conduct of military personnel and the security of defense facilities during periods of heightened public interest.

A FRAMEWORK FOR DEFENSE SUPPORT TO DOMESTIC EVENTS

Events Requiring Defense Support

Defense resources may be needed to support two types of events:

- **Public Participation Events.** Public Participation Events typically involve mass attendance at large venues by the general public. These events are usually international sporting, cultural, or religious gatherings. Operations GOLD (the Sydney 2000 Games; see Appendix 1) and ACOLYTE (the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth

⁶ Culturally, most militaries are averse to performing significant domestic roles. This is an appropriate safeguard of civil liberties in most circumstances, but a reflexive tendency to push back on DESO tasks, even ones that, realistically, may inevitably come to the military, may lead to last-minute scrambles to cover demanding requirements. This adds risk and inconvenience, including risk to the military's public image if a task is compromised because of inadequate preparation.

Games; see Appendix 3) are examples of such events. Because of their scale and complexity, Public Participation Events create the greatest demand for surge support across the widest range of capabilities. The requirement to secure large venues, while at the same time allowing ready public access, demands significant security resources. DE support may also include general support of the event itself, such as logistic, ceremonial, and communications tasks and access to defense facilities. The high public profile of these events requires careful management of the military's presence and visibility to ensure an obtrusive security effort does not detract from the events' essentially peaceful purpose.

- **Elite Participation Events.** Elite Participation Events normally involve relatively small-scale attendance by senior political or government figures at heavily secured "locked down" venues. Elite Participation Events are usually high-level political or economic gatherings. Operation GUARDIAN II (CHOGM 2002; see Appendix 2) is an example of this type of event. More recently, visits by individual foreign dignitaries (such as the President of the United States) have also required DESO. Because the venue security requirements of Elite Participation Events are smaller than for Public Participation Events, they usually require less defense support. However, Elite Participation Events bring an increased security risk associated with senior international visitors and the high national importance of these activities. As a result, DESO associated with Elite Participation Events usually command a very high government priority. The political nature of event business may also attract protest activity. DESO tasking must therefore be carefully managed to ensure personnel avoid confrontations with the public that could damage the military's image.

In addition to these classifications, major events can be categorized according to the jurisdiction (state/provincial or federal/national⁷) with primacy in the event's conduct or management (as distinct from jurisdiction over their domestic security aspects). Respective nations' constitutional peculiarities will determine whether such a categorization is useful. Generic classification criteria might be as follows:

- **State Led, Nationally Supported.** In these events, the host state leads all aspects of event and security planning and execution, and the national government provides support as necessary. National support can include defense contributions. The Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games are an example of a state-led, nationally supported event.
- **Nationally Led, State Supported.** These events are normally international events hosted by the national government in the territory of one of its states. The federal government would lead all aspects of planning and execution but, in most cases, would need to coordinate with the affected state jurisdiction for security arrangements because of the state's jurisdiction over domestic security. CHOGM 2002 is an example of a nationally led, state-supported event.

Dimensions of Support. The capability surge required to support a domestic event may have both **quantitative** and **qualitative** dimensions. Most additional requirements are quantitative; that is, they involve capabilities that civil authorities already have but that they do not maintain in the quantities needed for a large event. Simple venue access control is an example of a quantitative surge. Policemen could perform access control, but the additional security requirements of a major event, such as a Summer Olympics, would easily exceed most civil

⁷ Henceforth in this paper, the term "state" will be used to refer to states, provinces, and local or municipal entities ("cities") as sub-national entities and jurisdictions within a federal government system.

police forces' resources. Because this is a straightforward task, the commercial security industry is a logical source for the additional resources provided it receives sufficient notice of requirements. Low risk search (LRS) is another example of a quantitative surge. Policemen could receive a minimal amount of training to perform LRS, but applying the large number of resources required to search a major venue, such as a Summer Olympics complex, would probably not be possible without affecting other important policing tasks. Because this is an important task requiring a disciplined workforce, it does not lend itself to the commercial security industry. Military personnel, on the other hand, are a very suitable workforce for the quantitative surge needed in an LRS capacity.

Other surges are qualitative; that is, they involve acquiring capabilities that are more sophisticated than those civilian agencies hold for day-to-day requirements. Examples include the additional capabilities naval Clearance Divers (CD) provide over police divers, which might include deep diving, sonar scanning, and underwater explosive disposal capabilities. Further qualitative surges can be provided through DEs' in-house specialist research and development capabilities and through the buying power and industry contacts of defense acquisition and supply organizations.

Key Considerations

The following factors should be considered in planning DESO:

- **Relationships.** DESO involve temporary cooperation arrangements between defense and civilian agencies that may be unused to working with each other. Because there may be insufficient time to develop habitual processes and procedures for mutual support, the success of DESO will usually depend on a spirit of cooperation and effective working relationships among key individuals. Normal military career management practices, which see personnel rotating frequently through important DESO-related appointments, complicate the development of enduring relationships, especially at the local level. Usually, personnel must deliberately develop relationships in the time leading up to a specific operation. Relationship development requires an investment of time and personnel well in advance of an event, which, in turn, demands timely decisions on force assignment and may necessitate the early appointment of commanders and key staff.
- **Dedicated Planning Staff.** Because of their unique characteristics and relationship requirements, DESO require dedicated staffs to be established relatively early in the DESO planning stages. Ideally, staff should be located in the city or region where the supported event is to occur to enable staff to establish relationships with key civilian agencies. Because local knowledge and networks are valuable in developing these relationships and in anticipating requirements, military Reserve personnel from the local area are well suited to employment in planning staffs and in the command and control (C2) of DESO generally. Where possible, planning staffs should form the Forward Command Elements (FCE) of headquarters (HQ) that will command the eventual operation, with planners adopting operational roles within the HQ as the event approaches. FCE personnel should be carefully selected. They should possess the interpersonal skills to form sound working relationships with key personnel from other agencies, as well as the professional knowledge to make valuable and credible contributions to interagency planning and to guide the DE's planning effectively.
- **Organizational Culture.** The organizational cultures of military and civilian agencies may differ, and defense planners should be mindful of these differences in their interactions with other agencies. For example, DEs (especially militaries) could be

characterized as having a “planning culture” that emphasizes deliberate advance planning for events—even unlikely ones. In contrast, civilian emergency services often have more of a “response culture” that relies on excellent management of incidents as they arise. Both cultures are legitimate and well suited to the environments in which the respective groups normally operate, but they lead to very different approaches when preparing for major events. To build and maintain constructive relationships, defense planners must understand and respect organizational culture differences when interacting with other agencies.

- **Organizational Structures.** Interactions between the DE and civilian organizations must also take into account structural differences between organizations. For example, DEs usually recognize distinct tactical, operational, and strategic levels in activity management and have separate staffs responsible for each level. Civilian organizations usually are less well staffed; consequently, they may have a single staff or individual responsible for coordination at all levels, especially in relation to infrequent or unusual special events. Defense personnel working with civilian agencies should be aware of these structural differences and able to mirror this range of responsibilities.
- **Lines of Operation.** Most DESO will involve security measures in support of two lines of operation: prevention and response.
 - **Prevention.** The prevention line of operations consists of measures intended to stop security incidents from occurring. Prevention is usually achieved through two subordinate lines of operation: denial and deterrence.
 - **Denial.** Denial consists of measures intended to make it practically impossible to perpetrate a security incident. Denial operations include physical security measures, such as perimeter security and access control, and searches to provide the highest level of assurance that a venue, vehicle, or person is free from explosives, weapons, or other dangerous contraband. Denial can also be achieved by convincing security violators that security measures are so effective that their efforts are unlikely to succeed. This form of denial relies on effective information operations (IO).
 - **Deterrence.** Deterrent measures discourage security violations by making perpetrators afraid to attempt them. Deterrence usually involves convincing potential security violators that their efforts are likely to be detected, leading to unacceptable consequences. Deterrence is different from denial in that deterrence relies on perpetrators having a threshold of acceptable consequences, such as a desire for personal survival or to avoid imprisonment. Deterrence is less likely to succeed against highly motivated people, such as extremists prepared to commit suicide or risk injury, death, or arrest in the conduct of a security violation. Successful deterrence also relies on effective IO.
 - **Response.** Response operations involve measures to deal with security incidents that have occurred. These could be similar to civilian police law enforcement or emergency services responses (such as IEDD by bomb squads) but might include unique high-end DCA or specialist CT assault capabilities.

Defense personnel involved in DESO planning must understand clearly how defense support will contribute to the prevention and response lines of operation so they can

inform decisions on the support provided and the necessary force design. Prevention is usually the most cost-effective way of reducing security risks.

- **Priorities of Support.** Requests for defense support for domestic events can cover a broad range of functions, and it may not be possible or desirable to provide all of the support requested. To provide sound advice, defense planners must clearly understand how each element of support requested will contribute to the organizers' and the government's objectives for the event. Relatively unsophisticated and low-profile defense support to prevention operations may sometimes address the most likely security threats in a more direct way than high-end response capabilities. For example, LRS of venues focuses directly on threats from bombs, which may constitute the most likely and dangerous threat to an event. A terrorist hostage siege might be much less likely but, by posing a politically dangerous crisis for the government, such a threat could justify the provision of sophisticated CT special recovery support. Force design should be conducted with a clear understanding of these priorities.
- **Expectations.** Local, state, and national governments, event organizers, and the general public will have high expectations of DE (especially military) support for domestic events. These expectations may lead to unsustainable demand for that support. Expectations must be managed from the outset by clearly articulating the capabilities and limitations that DE support may bring. Expectations of military performance in a security crisis will be particularly high. To ensure expectations are met, consideration should be given to incorporating a reserve of capacity in the forces assigned to DESO.

Principles

In addition to the foregoing considerations, planning for DESO should observe the following principles:

- **Civil Primacy.** Every aspect of DESO should reflect the primacy of the supported civilian agencies and authorities. This must take into account whether the associated event is state or nationally led.
- **Early Force Assignment.** To afford maximum time to develop relationships, establish mission-specific capabilities, conduct specialist training, provide notice for Reserve participation, and avoid personnel turbulence, forces for DESO should be identified and assigned early. Although such operations have significant lead times, force assignment is often late because of a tendency for strategic planning staffs to give priority to core business crises that arise with little notice. Planning staffs must aggressively pursue force assignment as soon as force requirements are identified.
- **Early Planning.** Planning for DESO should begin as early as possible, which is normally when the lead civilian jurisdiction convenes the appropriate planning forum (e.g., a dedicated organizing task force). This often occurs 24–36 months before the event, or earlier in the case of an Olympics. A dedicated FCE should be established early enough before an event—a minimum of 12 months—to influence resource forecasts, specialist training, equipment acquisition, and service personnel assignment action. Ideally, FCEs should include personnel with previous DESO experience.
- **Skilled Personnel.** Personnel assigned to DESO should hold relevant skills. Identifying and assigning such people may require careful auditing of the skills of

available personnel, as well as specialist training. Previous DESO experience is also highly desirable, especially in planning and liaison staffs.

- **“Event Personnel Experience.”** DESO often require military members to render service that is inconvenient and attracts little recognition in the form of pay or service awards. DESO nevertheless rely heavily on enthusiastic and, frequently in the case of Reservists, voluntary service. An unsatisfactory experience in a DESO will discourage involvement in subsequent operations. Significant effort may be required to ensure military personnel involved in DESO have a favorable experience. This effort demands careful attention to personnel arrangements, such as “conditions of service” and the accommodation and amenities available to deployed personnel.⁸ Consideration should be given to special equipment issues that personnel can retain as souvenirs of the operation and, where national regulations allow it, medallic recognition for participants. The need for well-developed personnel support plans imposes a requirement for dedicated personnel staff capacity within a FCE.

Types of Support

The types of DESO are unlimited but can generally be classified as involving either general or security support.

- **General Support.** General support consists of non-security-related assistance to the conduct of the event. General support is often quite simple and may range from support to event logistics to providing access to defense facilities for event car parking. As a general rule, DEs should not provide general support that is available from commercial or other civilian sources, but this rule must be balanced against government interests in the conduct of a successful event. In some countries, event organizers can pay for general support provided by DEs; requiring payment can restrain the demands for defense support. DEs can at times provide low-cost general support that does not involve significant work by defense personnel, such as facilities access, to demonstrate goodwill to supported agencies. This support can be useful in maintaining positive working relationships between defense leaders and event organizers and as a tradeoff against demands for more expensive types of support.
- **Security Support.** Security support consists of all activities that contribute directly to event security. This support requires close coordination with civilian police and emergency services authorities from the lead jurisdiction and is usually the major component of DESO.

Levels of Support. General and security support can be classified in three levels:

- **Level One.** Level One support is general support provided directly to event managers. Common examples include—
 - Assistance in managing and delivering venue logistics
 - Communications
 - Transportation

⁸ The term “conditions of service” is used here to refer, collectively, to all forms of remuneration, support, and recognition that apply to personnel tasked with DESO. As operational *deployments* within the national domestic environment, which may be prolonged, DESO may fall outside the normal parameters for domestic conditions of service. Special consideration may be needed to take account of things such as family communications for personnel deployed away from their home locations, and special rest and recreation arrangements for security shift workers, etc.

- Ceremonial
 - Music (military bands)
 - Facilities access.
- **Level Two.** Level Two support is security support to the civilian jurisdiction hosting the event that is **not** expected to involve the application of force by military personnel. It usually involves support for the management of hazards from explosive devices (bomb management) and CBRN materials.
 - **Bomb Management.** Bomb management consists of measures to prevent and respond to threats from explosive devices and similar dangerous contraband. Bomb management support provided along the **prevention** line of operation can be conveniently categorized as “search,” while support provided along the **response** line of operation is usually IEDD.
 - **Search.** Preventive measures can be grouped under search, which involves searching venues, people, and vehicles to provide the highest level of confidence that they are free from explosives or other dangerous items. Categories of defense search support include the following:
 - **LRS.** LRS is a relatively simple task that can be taught quickly to a wide range of military personnel. It is particularly suitable for military Reserves. LRS can be extremely manpower intensive and is sometimes the largest single requirement for military support. Although most civilian police forces have some LRS capabilities, Public Participation Events usually require additional support.
 - **Technical Specialist Search (TSS).** TSS involves using technology and specialist skills to provide the highest possible level of confidence that a designated area or thing is devoid of dangerous contraband. Not all militaries maintain TSS capabilities; those that do have very limited ones that usually exist within specialist CT or military engineer units. Substantial TSS resources must be developed for specific operations with significant lead time. These surge capabilities are usually best established within elements that have explosives expertise, such as Combat Engineers or explosive ordnance units. Few civilian police forces maintain TSS capabilities, and large events are therefore likely to incur a requirement for TSS support, which the military may be best suited to provide.
 - **Explosive Detection Dogs (EDD).** Military EDDs can be used to supplement civilian police resources for search tasks.
 - **Underwater Search.** Military divers with appropriate skills (such as naval mine CDs) can be used to provide search effects in underwater parts of venues, such as wharves or waterways.
 - **IEDD.** Response to explosive devices consists of measures to neutralize or destroy improvised explosive devices. The military can supplement civilian police IEDD capabilities by providing IEDD teams drawn from standing explosive ordnance disposal elements. Domestic IEDD capabilities may differ somewhat from military capabilities and usually are not maintained at a high level within most militaries; therefore, where extensive IEDD support is required, it may be necessary to bring together IEDD assets from across all military services. Doing so imposes a

consequent need for equipment and training standardization, which can require significant lead time. For this reason, the ability of the military to provide IEDD support easily should not be assumed, and preparation, at least to the extent of auditing the military capacity against domestic standards, should commence early in the planning process.

- **CBRN Response (CBRNR).**⁹ CBRNR consists of measures to detect and dispose of CBRN hazards and to manage the consequences of a CBRN material release (“consequence management”). Most civilian jurisdictions maintain some capability for chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) response, usually within the hazardous materials (HAZMAT) elements of their firefighting services. Few civilian authorities, however, have the more sophisticated capability to deal with CBR devices that have explosive components or to deal with nuclear explosive devices. As a result, military support from specialist units will almost always be needed, and it may be necessary to negotiate especially sophisticated support from partner nations. Established military-to-military relationships are particularly valuable in these negotiations.
- **Level Three.** Level Three capabilities consist of high-end CT capabilities and other forms of support that might be required of the military *in extremis*. This support could involve the application of lethal force by the military. Although many countries have standing plans for the use of such military capabilities in domestic circumstances, the special requirements of event security may necessitate the pre-positioning of relevant force elements near the event location to provide a timely response. Examples include CT assault teams, fighter aircraft for DCA coverage, and naval assets to support maritime CT. These elements may require extensive coordination and rehearsal with local authorities leading up to an event. Subject to national laws, there may also be a need for event-specific legislation to allow Level Three support.

Other Considerations

Intelligence. Intelligence is fundamental to security efforts, whether military/defense or civil/law enforcement in nature, but it has different connotations for those environments. Military intelligence is often characterized by a predictive purpose, high security classifications, and a very specialized workforce applying established analytical processes. In DESO, collaborative intelligence efforts require these characteristics to be reconciled with a civilian culture that is focused at least equally on the retrospective investigation of crimes that have already happened. Nevertheless, DEs can add considerably to the intelligence efforts of local civilian law enforcement authorities by providing access to national sources and specialized analysis tools and skills. Collaboration can be complicated by information security requirements on both sides (military, to protect intelligence sources and analysis results; civilian, to preserve the evidentiary integrity of information for use in prosecutions). Because of this, successful collaboration can be difficult and requires detailed early planning, which may involve special facilities provisions to allow defense classified communication and information systems to be deployed without compromising physical and information security standards.

⁹ In U.S. literature, the term “CBRNE” has emerged lately, adding the category of “high-yield” conventional explosives (“E”) to the “WMD” threat spectrum. Not all countries make this grouping; most include all conventional explosives in the general category of improvised explosive device disposal (IEDD), regardless of yield. This paper reflects the latter practice.

Training. DESO impose some unique individual and collective training demands. In addition to training for the specific tasks they will perform in support of an event, defense personnel must understand the cultural and social peculiarities of an operation. These peculiarities include likely contact with the civilian population and the importance of high standards of military conduct at all times to avoid compromising the event experience for its civilian participants, to leave a positive and professional impression of the forces involved, and to maximize the preventive security value of the military presence. Personnel involved in security duties may also need specialized training in the legal and “rules of engagement” implications of the use of force. Training that is sensitive in nature may need to be conducted “out of sight”; site-specific training, such as critical response to event venues, may need to be carefully coordinated with venue staff to ensure adequate access without affecting other important preparations. Finally, a DE may be asked to provide training to civilian event staff and law enforcement personnel in areas where it has particular expertise.

C2. The challenge of C2 in DESO is to make the defense assets provided as responsive as possible to the supported civilian lead agency without compromising the legal requirement (in most countries) for military personnel to remain under military command at all times. Here, the legal definition of “command” becomes significant: command connotes lawful authority as well as lawful accountability. Although a civilian agency or jurisdiction may have primacy in relation to an event and its security, that primacy will not normally confer authority over supporting military forces or accountability for what they do. This situation creates the potential for unhelpful “seams” to appear in the coordination of civilian and military efforts. This challenge is most evident in the provision of security support, where responsiveness is most critical but where there is the greatest opportunity for defense personnel to be in harm’s way or to use force in the course of their duties.

The best solution to DESO C2 is to develop robust personal relationships between military and civilian leaders at all levels and to integrate C2 architectures as closely as possible. Relationships ensure commonality of purpose, understanding, and a spirit of cooperation; integrated C2 places personnel with the necessary lawful command authority where they can understand requirements immediately and issue timely instructions for support and cooperation. An example might be the co-location of military command and liaison elements with appropriate communications capability with a civilian event security HQ (such as a police command center). Such integration may impose a force structure overhead, but it is unavoidable in order to achieve adequate responsiveness.

Short-Notice Tasking. DEs involved in DESO are vulnerable to short-notice, high-priority tasking that arises in the late stages of planning. Short-notice tasking may occur because of the generally shorter planning horizons of civilian agencies, leading to the late identification of requirements, or because of overly optimistic assumptions about initial capability solutions, such as the use of public volunteers or the availability of commercial capacity for an event function. Regardless of the reason, high-priority requirements that remain unfilled late in the preparation process introduce significant risk to the event. The urgency of solving these problems may lead governments to turn to their militaries for reliable capability fixes rather than jeopardize a strategically important event by seeking less certain solutions at the last minute.¹⁰ To minimize the risk of a surprise tasking, DEs should become deeply integrated into the planning process as early as possible, use their participation to gain

¹⁰ See, for example, recent reporting of fears of late and substantial demands on the British military to support the 2012 London Olympics. George Parker and James Blitz, “MoD Concerned over bigger Olympics role,” *Financial Times*, July 17, 2011, available <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/0/2c807850-b07a-11e0-a5a7-00144feab492.html>, viewed September 8, 2011.

awareness of potential requirements, and help civilian agencies to develop robust solutions early. It may be better to prompt civilian agencies to consider (and, hopefully, discount) military support for certain tasks than to wait for an (inevitable) request that comes late.

Benchmarking. Where a qualitative capability surge is necessary, an appropriate “target” for that capability should be set to ensure needs are met without over-investment in temporary requirements. One means of doing this is to benchmark capability aspirations against the experience of previous similar events. For example, in gauging requirements for a periodic event such as an Olympics, it is useful to study the capabilities and approach developed for the previous iteration of that event. Among other things, this helps planners visualize the practical demands of the task and the application of capabilities. Naturally, requirements will vary in detail according to each event’s peculiarities and specific factors, such as location and security threat: nevertheless, suitable previous events could be adopted as benchmarks from which capability levels can be adjusted to suit the circumstances of forthcoming events.

Residual Capabilities. The conduct of a DESO may leave a nation’s military with some new capabilities or experience that, while developed specifically for that event, may have residual value either for the forces’ normal military roles or for subsequent DESO. For example, an extensive LRS capability has simple but distinct training and equipment requirements. Having invested in that capability, it would be wise to “capture” the capability to reduce the difficulty of regenerating it for the next event. This capture could involve careful documentation of training, operational lessons learned, and personnel qualified, as well as recovery and storage of any specialist equipment. In the case of more elaborate security capabilities, such as IEDD or CBRN response, new capabilities should be carefully analyzed to determine if they have conventional military value that can be transferred into the force.

Recommended Planning Checklist

Using the concepts and terminology developed in the preceding framework discussion, a DE might approach the planning of a forthcoming DESO as outlined below. Precise timing for the stages suggested depends on the event, but each stage should be attempted as early as possible:

- Identify the agency or agencies with prime responsibility for and jurisdiction over the event.
 - Clarify the key individuals and organizations with which relationships must be established.
 - Clarify event timings and locations and ensure the entire DE understands them, especially the senior leadership. These will not be negotiable.
 - Determine the national government policy for defense support to the event. This involves clarifying the national priority of the event and hence the degree of risk the government intends to take in the event’s successful execution. The priority will indicate the government’s ultimate willingness to commit defense resources to ensure event success.
- Appoint a defense planning leader and establish a working relationship between that individual (or agency) and the relevant event leaders.
 - Subject to national practices, begin to produce relevant operational documentation (such as a planning order).
 - Consider establishing a dedicated defense planning staff or even a FCE for the event.

- Work with the primary agencies to determine the requirements for defense support. Depending on the tasks involved, special legislative requirements may need to be introduced into the lawmaking process at this stage.
- Design the C2 model for the DESO (e.g., raise an *ad hoc* JTF or task an existing formation), task defense agencies, and assign forces. If necessary, issue further operational documentation, such as execution orders and force assignment directives, at this stage.
- Generate the necessary forces. This can involve concentrating forces in the event locality and providing training as required).
- Execute the DESO.
- Reconstitute forces. This includes identifying and documenting lessons and recovering equipment for subsequent operations.

CONCLUSION

Inevitably, nations' DEs will continue to be tasked to support the conduct of major non-military events that occur in their domestic environments. Although it constitutes out-of-role employment for militaries, this tasking makes good sense from governments' and taxpayers' perspectives, especially in times of fiscal constraint. As military activities, DESO have unique characteristics that must be understood if they are to be conducted efficiently. Each operation, however, is different, and early planning and engagement with the civilian agencies leading each event will always be necessary to ensure its peculiarities are understood and allowed for. Every host nation is different as well, and the constitutional, legal, cultural, and economic particularities of each will affect the way a DESO is executed.

Notwithstanding these differences and complications, planning must start somewhere. Much DESO experience has been accumulated around the world, and this paper offers one construct by which to analyze a forthcoming DESO and its requirements.

Appendices:

- Appendix 1. Case Study: Operation GOLD
- Appendix 2. Case Study: Operation GUARDIAN II
- Appendix 3. Case Study: Operation ACOLYTE

Appendix 1: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Operation GOLD)

Introduction

On September 23, 1993, the International Olympic Committee announced that Sydney would host the 2000 Summer Olympic Games (the Summer Games).¹¹ Along with this came host city responsibilities for the 2000 Paralympics. The Games fell naturally into the category of a Public Participation Event. In the terms of Australia's Protective Security Coordination Centre, the 2000 Games would be a state-led, Commonwealth-supported activity, with primacy and host jurisdiction responsibilities going to the state of New South Wales (NSW), of which Sydney is the capital.¹² Very quickly, the Australian Federal Government anticipated that the security of the Games¹³ would be beyond the resources of the host jurisdiction and would require the pooling of resources from other jurisdictions.¹⁴ It would include a contribution from the Australia Department of Defence ("Defence") that would be much greater than its normal involvement in domestic activities.¹⁵

Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) support to the Games—named Operation GOLD—commenced in 1998 and was reported as completed in the 2000–2001 Defence Annual Report. Operation GOLD was announced publicly on March 16, 2000.¹⁶ It employed 5,622 Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel in a range of security and non-security roles, but the figure of 4,000 personnel (the average force size during the Games operational period) is most often quoted. Brigadier Philip McNamara, Commander, Special Operations, first mentioned this figure publicly in an address to the Royal United Services Institution of NSW early in 2000.¹⁷ Defence Minister John Moore and Attorney General Daryl Williams subsequently repeated it in April 2000.¹⁸ This figure remained the same through subsequent media coverage up until the Games,¹⁹ making Operation GOLD the second-largest ADF deployment since the Vietnam War (after the International Force in East Timor [INTERFET] peacekeeping deployment to East Timor in 1999–2000). Security tasking involved unprecedented contributions from the ADO, which required the development of new capabilities with special application to domestic security. Some of the new capabilities endured after Operation GOLD ended. The Games also constituted the largest homeland security effort Australia had mounted since the Second World War, establishing capabilities, experience, and intergovernmental relationships that would influence the national approach to subsequent special event security requirements in the post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) period. The non-security support provided under Operation GOLD was also extensive, including

¹¹ *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Vol. 1—Preparing for the Games*, p. 12. Available <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pgooo748.htm>, viewed August 8, 2005.

¹² The Protective Security Coordination Committee (PSCC) categorizes the security for events as either "state led, Commonwealth supported" or "Commonwealth led, state supported." Leonie Mack, PSCC, presentation to the 2006 Homeland Security Summit, Canberra, July 12, 2005.

¹³ The Olympics and Paralympics came to be referred to, collectively, as the Sydney 2000 Games. *Commonwealth Agencies' Security Preparations for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*, Australian Government Audit Office, 1998, available <http://www.anao.gov.au/WebSite.nsf/Publications>, accessed September 6, 2005.

¹⁴ Alan Thompson, "Working Paper No. 23: Management of Australia's Counter-Terrorism Program." Canberra: Australian Defence Studies Centre, 1994, p. 13.

¹⁵ *Defending Australia 1994*, p. 138.

¹⁶ John Moore MP and Daryl Williams MP, Joint Media Statement, March 16, 2005, available <http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2005/05100.html>.

¹⁷ Quoted in Martin Chulov and David Kennedy, "Games security revealed," *The Australian*, March 1, 2000.

¹⁸ *Army newspaper*, April 13, 2000, p. 7.

¹⁹ The *Defence Annual Report 2000–2001* states that 5,622 Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel supported the Games, with a force size of around 4,000 at any one time. Department of Defence, 2001, p. 81.

contributions to ceremonial, administrative, communications, and logistic functions and use of ADO real estate. For a number of reasons, therefore, Operation GOLD is a useful DESO case study.

Because of its relative recency and the sensitive or classified nature of much of the ADO's involvement, open-source information on Operation GOLD is sparse.²⁰ The information contained in this case study was obtained from open-source material to the greatest extent possible and supplemented by personal conversations and observations from the author's perspective as a participant.

Games Management and Jurisdiction

In keeping with normal Olympics practice, the organization of the Games was the responsibility of specially constituted Organising Committees—the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG) and the Sydney Paralympics Organising Committee. These committees were formed by the NSW Government as the conducting jurisdiction. Recognizing the event's strategic national significance, the Federal Government also established its own task force drawn from the relevant Commonwealth departments.

ADO Responsibilities

Under Australia's constitutional model, the primary responsibility for the security of the Games fell to those states in which Games activities were held. Because Sydney was the host city, the principal responsibility fell on NSW, but all states bore some responsibility. The most significant of these fell on the other "Olympic States"—Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and the Australian Capital Territory. These became Olympic "jurisdictions" by providing venues for the Olympic Soccer competition, which was the only Olympic sport contested outside the Sydney area.²¹ The Olympic Torch Relay also brought a Games-related security liability because it passed through every Australian jurisdiction. Defence, as part of the Federal Government, was technically in a supporting role in all of these efforts. ADO contributions to Games security should therefore have been made in response to requests from state authorities for assistance in areas where state resources or capabilities were inadequate.

In addition to security, the ADO accepted a number of general support tasks. The ADO bore no special obligation to perform these, but in some cases it provided a unique capability (for example, in having ship berthing facilities close to the Sydney city center through its Garden Island Navy base) or was a cost-effective source for a particular capability required only for the Games (for example, a courier service for samples taken as part of the Olympics drug testing program). In the case of the Olympics Bus Squadron, the ADF provided a last-minute solution to a critical capability shortfall that Games organizers had been unable to fulfill.

Operation GOLD

Despite the "early warning" provided in 1993 by the naming of Sydney as the Games' host city, detailed ADO planning for the Olympics did not begin until 1997. In 1997 personnel began to be assigned full time to liaison duties with NSW authorities and to a small planning staff.²² The Australian National Audit Office's 1998 review of Commonwealth agencies' security preparations for Games security did not reveal any extensive planning by Defence up

²⁰ Australia observes a "30-year rule" for the automatic release of most classified information. Games information, therefore, will not be available for some time.

²¹ *Commonwealth Agencies' Security Preparations for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*, 1998, para. 1.27.

²² Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 18.

to that point, although 59 items “related to ADF support” were identified in a September 1997 request from SOCOG to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.²³ Although detailed plans were not formulated until 1998, Defence remained aware of potential Olympics tasking, such as bomb response, from 1993 onward.²⁴ A one-star officer was appointed within (then) Strategic Command Division of Headquarters ADF to oversee planning efforts at the strategic level. Significantly, this officer had previously been head of Defence’s Public Affairs agency.²⁵

Given the ADO’s supporting role in Games security, detailed planning could not commence until information on support requirements became available. That information began to emerge in 1997 from two sources:

- National requirements, identified through Protective Security Coordination Committee (PSCC) processes
- State requirements generated directly by states.

National Requirements. Two important areas of security support were identified in a 1997 PSCC review of national protective security capabilities. That review revealed a shortfall in national capabilities to respond to chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) threats or incidents and to resolve a terrorist incident taking place aboard a ship underway (ship underway recovery, or SUR). These shortfalls were assessed as substantial and needing to be addressed quickly. The nature of the SUR capability meant the ADF could best address the shortfall. The Special Air Service Regiment (SASR) pursued this capability.²⁶ In the CBR area, the shortfall required capability development by both state authorities and the ADF. The CBR response (CBRR) shortfall was identified through an audit of nuclear, biological, and chemical defense (NBCD) capabilities that was conducted within the ADF in 1997–1998. This shortfall was approached very much from an ADF operational perspective but identified key risks associated with anticipated ADF roles in the security of the forthcoming Olympics. The National Security Committee of Cabinet approved the establishment of a specialist CBRR capability in June 1998.²⁷ Within Defence, the key decisions relating to addressing the CBRR deficiencies had been made by September 1998.²⁸

State Requirements. Also during 1997, the New South Wales Police Service (NSWPS), as the agency responsible for Games security, began to identify capability shortfalls for which ADO support was requested.²⁹ These shortfalls existed principally in the areas of bomb search and response. Some of the other Olympic states requested similar support at much smaller levels.

As security support requirements became clearer during 1998, planners merged state and national requirements into a consolidated “bill” for ADO support. Merging the requirements enabled some judgments to be made on the feasibility of providing each type of support and on the best means of delivering it. The support requirement that emerged by the end of 1998

²³ *Commonwealth Agencies’ Security Preparations for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. 1998, para. 2.7.

²⁴ See, for example, *The Australian Army in Profile 1997*, p. 104.

²⁵ “The D’Hage Code,” *The Bulletin*, September 6, 2005, p. 67.

²⁶ Ian McPhedran, *The Amazing SAS*, Sydney: Harper-Collins, 2005, pp. 118–119.

²⁷ *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, May 2005, p. 19.

²⁸ Personal conversation with Lieutenant Colonel Craig Petrie, Project Officer for chemical, biological, and radiological response (CBRR) capability 1997–1999, Canberra, September 6, 2005.

²⁹ Peter Rath, “Olympic Security Planning Committee,” in Alan Thompson ed. *Terrorism and the 2000 Olympics*, Canberra: Australian Defence Studies Centre, 1996, p. 187.

did not vary greatly in scope over the period up until the Games, but estimates of the quantity of some support types did change.

The security support requirement that had crystallized by the end of 1998 was as follows:

- A counterterrorist (CT) capability pre-positioned in the Sydney area, consisting of—
 - A Tactical Assault Group (TAG) with helicopter-insertion capability
 - A SUR capability
 - A comprehensive, sophisticated CBRR capability
- A bomb response (improvised explosive device disposal [IEDD]) capability, sufficient to multiply the latent NSWPS IEDD capability several times
- A substantial high risk bomb search capability
- A substantial number of explosive detection dogs (EDD) and handlers
- A low risk bomb search capability, estimated at about 800 searchers
- An underwater bomb search capability
- The ability to provide CBRR and TAG coverage Australia-wide at short (classified) notice, with emphasis on the Olympic cities; involved developing a “flyaway” capability requiring airlift support at a commensurate degree of notice
- Command and control (C2) resources to facilitate the operational employment of ADO support
- Equipment support to supplement NSWPS capabilities, especially in bomb response
- Training support in CBRR first responder skills for state emergency services personnel.

The above support was to be provided for the Olympics Security Period (OSP). The OSP was eventually specified as beginning on September 1, 2000, in time for the Summer Games athletes to occupy the Olympic Village and ending on October 31, 2000, after the Paralympics ended. The Summer Games Opening Ceremony was scheduled for September 15, 2000.

The emergence of NSW’s support requirement allowed some initial judgments to be made on the sourcing of the necessary capabilities within the ADF, the organization of those capabilities, and the C2 arrangements that would be used.

Organization and C2 of ADO Support

HQ Australian Theatre (HQAST) commanded ADO support to the Games. HQAST was the ADF’s standing operational-level joint HQ and was based in Sydney. Support was classified in three categories:

- Security support, which included all non-CT security support
- General support
- CT support.³⁰

Assets providing this support were organized into and commanded through two Joint Task Forces (JTF):

- JTF 112 for security and general support

³⁰ *Operation GOLD: Joint Task Force 112 Handbook*, Australian Army, 2000, p. 3.

- JTF 114 for CT support.³¹

Responsibility for the JTF 112 functions was assigned to the Army's Land Command; JTF 114 responsibilities were assigned to HQ Special Operations.

JTF 112

HQ JTF 112 was created in January 1999 within Army's Land Command. It subsumed a small Olympics support planning staff that had been established in 1998.³² JTF 112 had no assets assigned to it initially but grew progressively as the Games approached. HQ JTF 112 was disbanded in January 2001.³³

JTF 112's security support responsibilities included—

- Support to NSWPS bomb management operations, consisting of—
 - Low risk search (LRS)
 - Clearance diving
 - IEDD
 - Technical high risk search (THRS)
- Venue security in the form of ongoing operational search
- CBRR and support to civilian consequence management (CM) (a “white” role)³⁴
- Aviation support.

General support responsibilities of JTF 112 included logistics, ceremonial (including Defence bands), transport (including providing a bus squadron for the Olympics Road Transport Authority, or ORTA), venue management, and communications.^{35, 36} As part of the Games preparations, HQ JTF 112 also performed a coordination function for ADO support that did not require forces (e.g., access to Defence facilities in the Sydney area, loans of Defence equipment). JTF 112 also had sustainment responsibilities for all forces eventually assigned to it, which required special accommodation, feeding, transportation, and welfare arrangements for assigned personnel.

- **JTF 112 Organization.** JTF 112's security support responsibilities were met by a C2 architecture and assigned forces.
 - **C2.** HQ JTF 112 commanded assigned forces from two locations. HQ JTF 112 “Main” was located at Sydney's Victoria Barracks; HQ JTF 112 “Forward” constituted the “ADF Desk” in the NSWPS Olympic Precincts and Regional Operations Centre (OPRO) at the Sydney Police Centre.³⁷ The Main HQ conducted routine administrative and command functions, and the Forward HQ was responsible for operational tasking decisions. The decision to co-locate the Forward HQ with the OPRO was made to enable seamless tasking of ADO

³¹ *Operation GOLD: Joint Task Force 112 Handbook*, p. 3.

³² *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 78–79. Also Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 18.

³³ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 120.

³⁴ Three types of roles are identified for ADF CBRR capabilities. “White” roles refer to support to civilian authorities in a domestic incident response capacity. “Green” roles refer to support to other ADF elements in a normal warfighting capacity. “Black” roles refer to support to the Special Forces' dedicated domestic counterterrorism capabilities.

³⁵ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 90–103.

³⁶ *Operation GOLD: Joint Task Force 112 Handbook*, Appendix 6.

³⁷ *Operation GOLD: Joint Task Force 112 Handbook*, p. 59.

assets in support of the NSWPS while preserving the legal principle that ADF assets must remain under ADF command. Co-location of an ADF command element with OPRO enabled immediate consultation between ADF and NSWPS personnel and prompt tasking of all required assets.³⁸

- **Assigned Forces.** Assignment of forces to JTF 112 for both general and security tasks was generally made along functional lines according to the identified tasks, leading to the following “order of battle”:
 - General Support³⁹
 - **Communications.** JTF 112 did not provide communications support to the Games per se, but its own C2 was facilitated by a Communications and Information Systems Squadron that provided a robust communications system utilizing ADF assets to provide redundancy to Sydney’s commercial communications for key functions, such as security coordination. This squadron was a task-organized *ad hoc* element that deployed ADF communications teams and equipment at a number of locations across Sydney, including tactical satellite and cryptographic management capabilities.
 - **Logistics Support.** A Joint Logistics Support Unit was established under JTF 112 to provide its internal logistic sustainment and a number of logistic support functions for the Games. This unit consisted of—
 - A Logistics Support Squadron to sustain ADF elements of JTF 112
 - A Joint Personnel Support Unit to provide personnel support to JTF 112 and to manage individual ADF personnel supporting Olympics functions (such as Venue Logistics Managers and a number of ADF personnel seconded to Olympics organizations); these personnel were embedded members of the venue management teams but wore uniforms and maintained their ADF identity
 - An ORTA Support Unit, which included several transportation elements supporting ORTA:
 - **Bus Support.** An ORTA Bus Squadron consisting of ADF personnel with appropriate driving licenses operating ORTA buses as part of the Games’ transport program; this support was an emergency task undertaken by the ADF at short notice when an alternative source of drivers planned by ORTA did not materialize
 - **Drug Testing Sample Courier Service.** A group of ADF drivers operating ORTA vehicles; this provided rapid transportation for the laboratory processing of samples collected as part of the Olympics drug testing program
 - **Ceremonial Support.** An Olympics Ceremonial Unit was established that consisted of an *ad hoc* HQ with an element providing protocol-related ceremonial support to the Games and official visitors attending the Games. The HQ also commanded ADF bands assigned to JTF 112 for the Games and coordinated the efforts of school cadets who provided Games support.

³⁸ *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Security*, p. 1, available <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pg001489.htm>, viewed September 4, 2005.

³⁹ *Operation GOLD: Joint Task Force 112 Handbook*, Appendix 6.

- **Facilities Access.** Although not requiring forces, and hence not on the order of battle, negotiated access to Defence facilities in the Sydney area for Olympics functions was an important form of ADF support; this support was coordinated through JTF 112. An example of facilities support is access to the Royal Australian Navy's Fleet Base East at Garden Island, which provided berthing facilities for cruise ships used to provide surge hotel accommodation in Sydney during the Games.
- Security Support
 - **LRS (including ongoing venue security).** An Operational Search Battalion (OSB) (an *ad hoc* Army unit)
 - **Clearance Diving.** A Clearance Diving Team (Royal Australian Navy)
 - **IEDD.** An Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Squadron (an *ad hoc* element organized by Army and composed of individuals from all three Services); established within the Joint Incident Response Unit (JIRU)
 - **THRS.** A High Risk Search (HRS) Squadron (an *ad hoc* Army element); established within the JIRU
 - **CBRR.** A CBRR Squadron (a new capability established by Army); established within the JIRU
 - **Aviation Support.** A Joint Aviation Group (an *ad hoc* capability, mostly helicopters, drawn from Army and Navy).

Each security force element of JTF 112 is examined in the following sections.

Operational Search Battalion

OSB was raised to provide an LRS capability in support of the NSWPS. LRS is the performance of simple visual searches of venues, vehicles, or individuals where there is no anticipation of a hazard to the searcher. The usual targets of searches are explosive devices or threat-related contraband, such as firearms. Despite the potential hazards of these items, searches in the Games security context were low risk because they were conducted to confirm that such items were absent rather than because their presence was suspected. LRS was employed for two purposes:

- To “sanitize” Games-related security locations (competition venues, athlete accommodation, etc.) before their use as a precaution to ensure locations were free of bombs or other hazards. Following an initial thorough search, locations remained “sealed” or “locked down” to prevent ingress of any new hazardous items.⁴⁰ The whole initial search and lockdown process was referred to as a “search and seal” operation
- To maintain the security seal on a location. Low risk searchers conducted searches of all vehicles entering Games locations. These searches involved OSB personnel maintaining 24 vehicle checkpoints on a 24-hour basis and performing an estimated 250,000 vehicle searches throughout the period of the Games.^{41, 42}

⁴⁰ *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Security*, pp. 3–4, available <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pg001500.htm>, viewed September 4, 2005.

⁴¹ *The Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 82–83.

⁴² *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Security*, p. 5, available <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pg001500.htm>, viewed September 4, 2005.

ADF searchers were not required to search people. LRS support to the NSWPS is an example of “quantitative surge” support; that is, it was support in an area in which the NSWPS possessed an equivalent capability but in insufficient quantity for the task at hand. ADF support enabled the NSWPS to surge to a higher quantity of capability at the same technical standard.

Army Reserve personnel attached to a dedicated unit on a voluntary basis performed LRS. To increase the attractiveness of Olympics service, the term “operational search” was used, and this term was incorporated in the unit’s title—hence, “Operational Search Battalion.”

Army Reserve members drawn from units across Australia largely manned OSB on a rotational basis over the Games period. Those volunteering for service underwent a specially developed 7-day training package to qualify as searchers. Centrally trained instructors delivered training on a distributed basis in home locations. Because of the simple nature of LRS, equipment requirements were unsophisticated and were largely restricted to mirrors and hand-held torches. The large number of searchers to be equipped necessitated some substantial equipment purchases for OSB.

The Army Reserve’s 2nd Division provided the unit’s core planning and staff capability, which was established about 12 months before the OSP. OSB’s strength varied on a preplanned schedule based on task requirements. At its peak strength, OSB consisted of about 1,800 personnel; 2,200 individuals participated in it over its entire life.⁴³ Most of the personnel were searchers, but the unit also had small operations, logistics, and administration elements. OSB was based at the East Hills Barracks in Sydney’s Western suburbs.⁴⁴

Most OSB tasks were preplanned, but the unit maintained a small reserve of capability for short-notice response.⁴⁵ Personnel deployed from East Hills to task sites in the Sydney area on a daily basis. OSB disbanded at the end of the OSP.

Joint Incident Response Unit

The JIRU was raised to provide the “high-end” security support capabilities required of JTF 112. The provision of CBRR support was a particular challenge because the required capability did not exist within the ADF. A rudimentary capability had existed in a Chemical and Radiological Response Team established as a part-time function within the Army’s School of Military Engineering but was so limited that it provided virtually no basis for a high-end CBRR capability.⁴⁶ The creation of the CBRR capability became the focus of a dedicated major acquisition project initiated in 1998 and for which \$23 million was allocated in the 1999–2000 Budget (Project Bloodhound).⁴⁷ A decision was made in late 1998 to combine this capability with the requested bomb response and THRS capabilities (including EDDs) into a single new unit: the JIRU.⁴⁸

The JIRU was to be raised progressively during 1999 and 2000 and become operational in time for the OSP. The unit was to disband when its tasks were complete, less a small residual

⁴³ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 82. Also Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 28.

⁴⁴ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 28.

⁴⁵ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 82.

⁴⁶ *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, May 2005, pp. 18–19.

⁴⁷ Ian McPhedran, “Games counter-terrorism costs \$23m,” *The Courier Mail*, Brisbane, May 12, 1999, p. 33. Also Budget Speech, Australian Parliament, May 11, 1999; and Budget Paper No. 2, 1999.

⁴⁸ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 80–81.

CBRR capability.⁴⁹ Responsibility for raising the JIRU rested with the Army through Land Command. Personnel and equipment for the unit, with the exception of equipment purchased under Project Bloodhound, were to be sourced on a temporary loan basis from the wider ADO and, where necessary, from overseas specialist agencies. At its peak strength, the JIRU contained 501 personnel.⁵⁰ The JIRU was based on the 2nd Combat Engineer Regiment (2 CER), a Brisbane-based Army unit manned by a combination of regular and Reserve personnel. Personnel began to be posted to 2 CER, specifically for service with the JIRU, in January 1999. The unit effectively grew in two locations, Brisbane and Sydney, until beginning to concentrate in Sydney (Holsworthy) in May 2000. Final concentration for the OSP occurred in August 2000. In all, the JIRU completed 480 security tasks in support of Games security by the end of the OSP.⁵¹

The JIRU was organized into an HQ and four functional squadrons, three of which each provided one of the unit's core operational capabilities (CBRR, IEDD, and THRS).⁵² The fourth squadron, the Operational Support Squadron, provided the unit's logistic and communications support.⁵³ A Technical and Scientific Support Group (TSSG), organized directly under the JIRU HQ, provided scientific support to all elements of the unit.⁵⁴ During the OSP, JIRU elements deployed on tasks either from the JIRU base at Holsworthy or from forward operating bases (FOB) located throughout the Sydney area. The HQ, the TSSG, and three operational squadrons were as follows:

- **HQ JIRU.** HQ JIRU was based on HQ 2 CER. It was “stood up” initially in Brisbane but relocated to Holsworthy Barracks in Sydney in May 2000. For the OSP, HQ JIRU mirrored the organization of HQ JTF 112 with its Main at Holsworthy and Forward at the OPRO. Robust secure communications connected both HQ locations and all deployed elements, providing voice, data, and image transmission capabilities between most nodes. Because of space and security limitations in the OPRO, the Forward element was kept small but had the ability to “reach back” via secure communications to elaborate advice capabilities at JIRU Main.
- **TSSG.** The TSSG consisted chiefly of the high-end scientific resources that supported the JIRU's CBRR capabilities. The precise competencies of the TSSG remain classified but included detection, analysis, and modeling capabilities for CBR materials.⁵⁵ Photographs of chemical analysis equipment shown in the unit's newsletter (*Jirumours*) show sophisticated mobile equipment. Most TSSG members were civilian scientists or technical specialists from Australia's Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) or overseas agencies, including the UK Defence Engineering and Research Agency and the U.S. Department of Energy.⁵⁶ Because

⁴⁹ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 80–81.

⁵⁰ “The Incident Response Regiment,” *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, May 2005, p. 19. Numbers drew down during the Paralympics, which had less extensive security requirements. Personal conversation with Mr. Nigel Catchlove, Executive Officer JIRU 1999–2000, Canberra, July 10, 2005. An aerial photograph of the JIRU at its height shows a very extensive array of personnel and equipment. *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 80.

⁵¹ *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Security*, p. 5, available at <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pg001500.htm>, viewed September 4, 2005.

⁵² JIRU Scrapbook, maintained by the Incident Response Regiment, Holsworthy Barracks. Also Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 58.

⁵³ *Jirumours* (JIRU unit newsletter), Vol.1, No. 3, August 1999, p. 1.

⁵⁴ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, pp. 50–58.

⁵⁵ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 58.

⁵⁶ *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, May 2005, p. 19. Also Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 50.

these constituted a unique source of scientific support and advice for the entire Games “security community,” they were concentrated into a specialist group located adjacent to the JIRU Main HQ. This proximity ensured the prompt availability of advice for operational requirements. All TSSG elements had a reach-back capability, allowing them to access further expertise from their parent organizations via secure communications. The TSSG drew heavily on DSTO expertise that had been developed through the Defence and Arms Control Programs of the Combatant Protection and Nutrition Branch.⁵⁷

- **CBRR Squadron.** The CBRR Squadron was formed to establish the ADF’s new CBRR capability, which would see its first operational tasking with the Games. The CBRR Squadron began to stand up as an independent organization in January 1999 and moved under JIRU command when that unit was officially raised on June 1, 1999.⁵⁸ The CBRR Squadron was stood up earlier than the other JIRU capabilities because—
 - The requirement for a CBRR capability was identified before the other JIRU capabilities
 - CBRR, as a new and extremely complex capability, would take the longest time to develop.

Unlike other JIRU capabilities, CBRR was intended remain in an independent form after the Games ended.⁵⁹

Details of the CBRR capability remain classified, but its focus was the detection, location, diagnosis, and rendering safe (“disposal”) of devices designed to disseminate CBR agents.⁶⁰ The CBRR Squadron also supported a new TAG capability for special recovery in CBR hazard environments.⁶¹ The Squadron was optimized for these relatively narrow tasks; even so, the development of a comprehensive capability necessitated the assembly of a large number of demanding and perishable skills that were in short supply in the ADF. Examples include EOD Technicians, doctors, nurses, and signalers. The capability also needed dedicated support from DSTO, which eventually became part of the TSSG.

Developing the CBRR capability was particularly difficult because it was new not only to the ADO but also worldwide. Suitable benchmarks from overseas were unavailable, so much of the capability design needed to be done within the Squadron. The design was complicated by the relatively low level of existing capability in the ADF. Although a rudimentary NBCD capability had been maintained, it was based on North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Cold War doctrine and equipment and was procedural in nature; relatively few ADF personnel had the specialized training necessary to develop a sophisticated CBRR capability from scratch, and that training was sourced from overseas.⁶² Furthermore, the Squadron’s equipment was still being procured. Some key equipment solutions were not even selected until mid-1999,

⁵⁷ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 58.

⁵⁸ *Jirumours*, Vol. 1 Issue 1, June 1, 1999, p. 1.

⁵⁹ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 80.

⁶⁰ McPhedran, *The Amazing SAS*, p. 120.

⁶¹ McPhedran, *The Amazing SAS*, p. 120.

⁶² The ADF had traditionally trained its nuclear, biological, and chemical defense (NBCD) specialists in either Canada or the United States. Since the late 1990s, virtually all specialist training had been done at the Canadian Forces NBCD School.

which meant training was often conducted at the last safe moment. Although the dedicated acquisition project staff performed admirably, the time pressures added significantly to the risks in raising the CBRR capability in time for the Games. Specialist advice from DSTO was critical in minimizing those risks in relation to sophisticated and rather arcane CBRR equipment, such as agent detectors.⁶³

The CBRR Squadron's training was extremely sophisticated. Although particulars are not available from open sources, indications show it included training with live CBR agents at the Canadian Defence Research Establishment at Suffield in Alberta.⁶⁴ This training may reflect the relationship established with the Canadian CBR defense community through the sourcing of ADF training in Canada over many years. Photographs in open-source documents reveal unique equipment in special applications; for example, protective "bomb suits" worn with compressed air breathing apparatus, electronic detection equipment, and rapid-erection decontamination and medical facilities.⁶⁵

The "white" role of the CBRR Squadron necessitated close working relationships with all civilian emergency services.⁶⁶ These relationships were established through combined training and interaction as all agencies developed CBRR capabilities in preparation for the Games.⁶⁷ The nature of CBRR incidents meant the CBRR Squadron needed to have close relationships with civilian police (for incident control and advice), fire (for HAZMAT response), ambulance (for casualty evacuation), and public health (for hazard warning) services. The CBRR Squadron's critical relationship was with the NSW Fire Brigades. This relationship was enhanced during the OSP by an exchange of liaison officers between response elements of the CBRR Squadron and NSW Fire Brigades HAZMAT.^{68, 69} To minimize response times during the OSP, the CBRR Squadron operated from two FOBs in the Sydney urban area. These were located at Garden Island Naval Dockyard (close to critical Games' sites near the central business district) and Timor Barracks in Dundas, which covered Sydney Olympic Park and Western Sydney sites.⁷⁰ Both were maintained throughout the Summer Games, reducing to just the Dundas FOB for the Paralympics.

⁶³ The Defence Science and Technology Organisation refers to this as "smart buyer advice."

⁶⁴ The Defence Research and Development Canada—Suffield Web site refers to training by the JIRU in preparation for the Sydney Olympics having been conducted at Suffield. http://www.suffield.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/ResearchTech/Products/CB_PRODUCTS/RD950 accessed August 15, 2005. Overseas training in CBRR is acknowledged in *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 81. An ADF contingent of about 100 personnel was at Suffield in April 2000. Rod Edwards, "Aussies visit Suffield," *Medicine Hat News*, Medicine Hat (Alberta), April 10, 2000, p. 2.

⁶⁵ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, pp. 81, 85; *Jirumours*, Vol. 2 Issue 5, June 1, 2000, pp. 3–4; Vol. 2, Issue 6, July 1, 2000, p. 5; Vol. 2, Issue 7, August 1, 2000, p. 5.

⁶⁶ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 52.

⁶⁷ For example, Exercise Golden Flame, the major interagency exercise held in May 2000, involved scenarios combining the CBRR Squadron with elements of the New South Wales Police Service (NSWPS), the NSW Ambulance, and NSW Fire Brigades (NSWFB). *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 85.

⁶⁸ Personal conversation with Chief Superintendent Jim Hamilton, Assistant Director Specialized Operations, NSWFB and HAZMAT Chief, Sydney 2000 Games, April 6, 2005. The JIRU official unit photograph of October 1, 2000, also shows uniformed NSWFB officers.

⁶⁹ NSWFB, *Protecting the People's Games: New South Wales Fire Brigades Post-Olympics Report* Sydney: NSWFB, 2000, p. 61.

⁷⁰ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 52.

A final key ADO contribution to the overall CBRR capability for the Games was overseas expertise. This expertise was mainly sourced through DSTO contacts or through established Australia, Britain, Canada, and America (ABCA) frameworks. For reasons associated mainly with their Cold War involvement in NATO, the United Kingdom, Canada, and United States had a more comprehensive range of CBRN defense science and technology capabilities than Australia. Their collective expertise allowed Australia to address any gaps in its own expertise by sourcing the necessary skills overseas.

- **HRS Squadron.** The HRS Squadron was formed to provide a THRS and EDD capability for Operation GOLD. HRS is conducted when there is a realistic expectation of risk to the searcher or when the consequences of an inadequate search (i.e., of missing something) are particularly high (e.g., in preparation for a VIP visit). The British Army developed the HRS discipline as a result of experience with terrorism in Northern Ireland. The normal targets of HRS are explosive devices or contraband caches that may have been protected by booby traps. HRS involves significantly higher skill levels and equipment sophistication than LRS and is the task of military engineers.

THRS is an Australian Army term used to describe a specialized form of HRS that involves the use of advanced techniques and technologies to provide the highest possible level of confidence that an area is devoid of explosives or contraband. The Royal Engineers (RE) developed this level of search in response to the long-delay explosive device threat demonstrated in the 1984 bombing of the Conservative Party Convention at the Grand Hotel in Brighton. The United Kingdom maintains its THRS capability within 33 Regiment RE.

Before 2000, a basic HRS capability had existed within the Royal Australian Engineers (RAE) for some years. Army search teams had supported state police forces in security preparations for visits by foreign heads of government.⁷¹ This search capability was only maintained as a secondary role and had never been developed to the level of THRS. In defining the new CBRR capability, a requirement was identified for a supporting HRS capability with THRS characteristics (but employable in a CBR hazard environment). Independently, an analysis of search requirements for Games security identified a requirement for a conventional (non-CBR) THRS capability. The funding available under Project Bloodhound provided an opportunity to address this capability shortfall by equipping a THRS sub-unit. An HRS Squadron was therefore incorporated in the JIRU structure as it was developed in late 1998.

Planning for the HRS Squadron's establishment proceeded during 1999, with a Squadron Commander and other key staff posted to the JIRU. It was quickly determined that Australia did not possess the skills to develop a THRS capability. Through Australia's contacts with the United Kingdom, the Squadron Commander was placed in an appropriate course at the UK National Search Centre in the second half of 1999. This formal training was followed by an attachment to 33 Regiment RE, which provided the opportunity to observe operational searches being conducted in the United Kingdom. This training opportunity created a benchmark for the JIRU's THRS capability and established a relationship with UK agencies that could be drawn

⁷¹ *The Defence Report 1992–1993*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1993, p. 61.

on for advice as training progressed. Given the state of Australian knowledge of the THRS discipline, it is doubtful the capability would have been developed successfully in time for the Games otherwise.

The HRS Squadron initially stood up in Brisbane occupying 2 CER facilities. Manning was problematic. The threshold skill set for THRS personnel was identified as the existing HRS skill, which was held by the Combat Engineer trade. The additional THRS skills were expected to require a further 6 months of full-time training. With the operational period for the Games, this meant that service with the HRS Squadron effectively required 1 year of full-time service. 2 CER, as an integrated unit, had only a limited number of full-time Combat Engineers, so additional personnel needed to be sourced from elsewhere. With much of the Army's regular Combat Engineer asset deployed to East Timor for the INTERFET operation, an alternative source of personnel was needed. This source was eventually found in the Army Reserve, with approximately 50 percent of the Squadron's final strength of searchers consisting of Reservists who volunteered for 12 months of full-time service.⁷² These personnel were sourced from the Reserve members of 2 CER and from 4 CER, a Melbourne-based Reserve unit. Other specialist members of the HRS Squadron were posted into the unit in January 2000.

Training for the HRS Squadron faced many of the same challenges as the CBRR Squadron, especially in relation to the acquisition and delivery of equipment at the last safe moment. Training was completed only days before the commencement of the OSP. The final stages of training were assisted by the attachment of two RE Search Advisers, which was arranged under the terms of Exercise Long Look, a longstanding short-term exchange program, and relied heavily on relationships established during the Squadron Commander's training the previous year. Because of the requirement to provide a search capability for CBR incidents, training included a significant CBR element. HRS Squadron personnel were also trained to provide "labor" for CBR CM tasks (e.g., the recovery and evacuation of CBR casualties from a contaminated area). This support relationship with the CBRR Squadron was practiced during exercises.

The HRS Squadron's EDD capability was established by brigading virtually the entire EDD asset of the Australian Army into the unit for the OSP.⁷³ The provision of EDD support to state agencies for security search purposes was a well-established ADF task. For example, EDDs had supported the Queensland Police during the Brisbane 1982 Commonwealth Games.⁷⁴ As an established capability, achieving the necessary EDD support was relatively straightforward; however, some additional dogs and handlers needed training to achieve the number of dog teams agreed upon by the NSWPS. Some new equipment, such as specialized EDD vehicles, was also provided under Project Bloodhound.

Most of the HRS Squadron's operational tasking during the Games was in the form of preplanned searches during the search and seal phase. A "response" element was maintained throughout the OSP for short-notice tasks. C2 for the HRS Squadron mirrored HQ JIRU arrangements but with only a minimal presence forward in the OPRO and the principal node in JIRU Main.

⁷² Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 50.

⁷³ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 57.

⁷⁴ *Defence Report 1982–1983*, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1983, p. 20.

No dedicated THRS capability was retained after the Games. The HRS Squadron disbanded after the OSP, with personnel either returning to “parent” units or moving to new postings. The newly raised, independent CBRR Squadron retained most new THRS equipment for use in future operations. The CBRR Squadron also absorbed the skills and training packages the HRS Squadron had developed, but no personnel had THRS as a primary responsibility.

- **EOD Squadron.** The JIRU’s EOD Squadron was formed to provide the ADF’s IEDD support to the NSWPS. Because the ADF’s established capability was understood to be fully operational and very similar to that of the NSWPS, the initial concept for the EOD Squadron was simply to concentrate virtually the entire ADF IEDD asset in Sydney for the Games. An audit of the ADF’s capability benchmark, existing equipment fleet, and operator training and currency standards revealed that much more work needed to be done to deliver the capability at the required standard.⁷⁵ To understand the challenges involved, an appreciation of the history and status of the ADF’s IEDD capability in 2000 is useful. Two elements of that capability—skills and organization—are analyzed below.

- **Skills.** In 2000, the ADF’s IEDD skills were vested in four different personnel trades:⁷⁶

- **Ammunition Trade of the Royal Australian Army Ordnance Corps (RAAOC).** This trade focuses on the explosives engineering aspects of ammunition logistics, but significant components of EOD and IEDD have been included since the 1920s. Personnel are referred to as Ammunition Technical Officers (ATO) (commissioned officers) or Ammunition Technicians (AT) (noncommissioned personnel). ATOs and ATs undertook the 4-week Defence IEDD (DEFIEDD) Course after completing their very comprehensive core training in explosives engineering and the technical aspects of ammunition logistics. The DEFIEDD Course was developed during the 1970s and was based heavily on British experience from Northern Ireland.⁷⁷ The skills involved were focused on noncombat scenarios⁷⁸ and support to civilian police forces in Australian peacetime settings, and techniques emphasized the use of the in-service “Echidna” remote positioning device (RPD).^{79, 80} The training provided in the DEFIEDD Course closely resembled that delivered to civilian police Bomb Technicians until the mid-1990s.

⁷⁵ Personal conversations with (then) Major Bruce Schiefelbein, Officer Commanding Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Squadron, JIRU, July–August 2000.

⁷⁶ “Trade” is the Australian Army’s term for an occupational specialization. These are referred to as “categories” by the Royal Australian Navy and “musterings” by the Royal Australian Air Force.

⁷⁷ For an insight into that experience, see Chris Ryder, *A Special Kind of Courage: 321 EOD Squadron—Battling the Bombers*, London: Methuen, 2005.

⁷⁸ These scenarios included operational scenarios in “lines of communication” and civil disturbance or counterinsurgency settings but did not include “battlefield” scenarios.

⁷⁹ Remote Positioning Devices (RPD) or the alternative, Remote Positioning Vehicles (RPV), refer to “bomb disposal robots.” These allow technicians to deal with a suspected improvised explosive device from a safe distance—a technique known as a “remote approach.” This technique is preferred to the “manual approach” for obvious safety reasons. In a peacetime setting, modern occupational health and safety requirements demand that a remote approach be used wherever possible. The availability of that option is therefore a minimum requirement for an IEDD capability for homeland security missions. Personal conversations with Mr. Terry Vincent and Mr. Bruce Schiefelbein, Australian Bomb Data Centre, April 1, 2005, and August 11, 2005.

⁸⁰ *Defence Report 1988–1989*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1989, p. 31.

- **EOD Technician Trade of the Army's RAE.** EOD Technicians were drawn from the ranks of the Combat Engineer trade. In 2000, most were commissioned officers or senior noncommissioned officers. To be selected for EOD Technician training, engineers needed to hold at least junior noncommissioned officer rank and be qualified as demolition supervisors. A small module of IEDD training, focused on operational or combat scenarios and not involving the use of RPDs, was included in the EOD course. By 2000, most EOD Technicians also undertook the DEFIEDD Course after obtaining their initial qualification.
- **Clearance Diver (CD) Category of the Royal Australian Navy.** CDs have always provided the Navy's EOD capability and are trained in conventional EOD as part of their core skills. By 2000, IEDD training was obtained by attending the DEFIEDD Course, which represented the benchmark for IEDD skills.⁸¹
- **Armament Fitter Mustering of the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF).** These personnel, who included both officers and junior and senior noncommissioned officers, possessed a range of differing EOD skill levels from basic to advanced levels. In 2000, the IEDD skills within the mustering were held by small teams that provided a basic IEDD response capability at some Air Force bases. Air Force IEDD training consisted of a 2-week "in-house" course delivered at the ammunition logistics facility at Orchard Hills near Sydney. This course focused on IEDD tasks that might arise on an Air Force base and did not seek to address support to the civilian police. It did not include the use of RPDs.⁸² In 2000 the Armament Fitter mustering was in the process of being merged with the Avionics Technician mustering as part of a skills rationalization, further diluting the mustering's focus on the IEDD capability.⁸³

In summary, in 2000 four different occupational specializations held IEDD skills within the ADF—none of which was centrally concerned with IEDD.⁸⁴ Training levels differed among specializations. The DEFIEDD Course probably provided the skill set best suited to homeland security scenarios or support to civilian police forces, but not all ADF IEDD operators took that course.

- **Organization.** In 2000, a common characteristic of IEDD capabilities throughout the ADF was that they were not a primary mission for any part of the force. With the exception of small instructional staffs at some service schools, IEDD was a secondary responsibility.⁸⁵ Historically, the ADF's principal IEDD capability resided with the Army's regional Senior Ammunition Technical Officer (SATO) cells. These were located in most state

⁸¹ Personal conversation with Captain Mike Angus, Royal Australian Navy (RAN), Commander, Australian Navy Mine Warfare and Clearance Diving Force Element Group 2000–2003, Canberra, August 27, 2005.

⁸² Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) IEDD Operator Course Block Syllabus, 1999.

⁸³ Personnel conversations with Group Captains Geoff Brown (former Officer Commanding 82 Wing) and Margaret Staib (senior RAAF logistics officer), Canberra, August 18, 2005.

⁸⁴ Bert Scharwz, "New task force faces biggest killer." *Defender* XXIII, no. 3 (2006), p. 32.

⁸⁵ Although EOD is a core element of the skills of Navy Clearance Divers, IEDD is a relatively small component that, up until 2000, was practiced much less often. Personal conversation with Captain Mike Angus, RAN, Commander, Australian Navy Mine Warfare and Clearance Diving Force Element Group 2000–2003, Canberra, August 27, 2005.

capitals and were chiefly concerned with the technical oversight of ammunition logistics functions in their respective regions. Other responsibilities included disposal of military explosive ordnance that was recovered within the region (conventional EOD) and IEDD support to local police forces on an “on-call” basis. SATOs were issued with a reasonably comprehensive suite of IEDD equipment, including “bomb trucks” and RPDs, but the technology level of that equipment had not been refreshed since the late 1980s with the introduction of the Echidna RPD.⁸⁶

Until the early 1990s, a robust technical supervision network existed for the SATOs within the Army’s Logistics Command. This network included a dedicated SATO EOD responsible for technical regulation of EOD and IEDD practices. This network progressively eroded as the ADF moved to more joint logistics arrangements from 1994 onward. By 2000, the SATOs were part of the Joint Ammunition Logistics Organisation, and the technical supervision framework for EOD and IEDD had been effectively dismantled.⁸⁷ Over the 1990s, civilian police force IEDD capabilities also matured, resulting in fewer requests for ADF support and a consequent decline in experience levels of ADF personnel.⁸⁸ This decline is detectable in annual *Defence Reports*. Although reporting of IEDD tasking is patchy, Reports between 1983 and 1988 show a decrease in the number of IEDD tasks undertaken by ADF EOD teams in support of police forces, declining from 55 in 1983–1984 to 12 in 1987–1988. After 1988, IEDD tasks were no longer reported. In comparison, the number of “conventional” EOD tasks attended increased from 272 in 1983–1984 to more than 1,000 in each of 1986–1987 and 1987–1988. As the number of tasks was distributed over teams operating across the states on a “shift” basis, it is reasonable to conclude that the ADF’s IEDD experience level was declining.^{89, 90}

By 2000, therefore, the ADF’s most sophisticated IEDD capability—that of the regional SATOs—reflected a 1980s capability benchmark and had probably atrophied considerably from that level because of a lack of technical supervision and operational experience.⁹¹ Other capabilities vested in the Army’s engineer units, Navy Clearance Diving Teams, and Air Force Armament Fitter elements were less sophisticated, especially in that they did not include a RPD capability and in some cases probably reflected a lower training level.⁹²

- o **Forming the Squadron.** A cadre staff for the Squadron, consisting of the Officer Commanding and key HQ personnel, was established in January 1999.⁹³ These personnel conducted planning for the raising of the full capability the following year. One of the legitimately “joint” elements of the JIRU, EOD Squadron was to be manned with personnel from all four of the

⁸⁶ *The Army in Profile 1997*, p. 103.

⁸⁷ Personal conversation with Mr. Terry Vincent, Director, Australian Bomb Data Centre, August 11, 2005.

⁸⁸ Bert Scharwz, “New task force faces biggest killer.” *Defender* XXIII, no. 3 (2006), p. 33.

⁸⁹ *Defence Reports: 1983–1984*: p. 118; *1985–1986*: p. 40; *1986–1987*: p. 35; *1987–1988*: p. 10.

⁹⁰ Personal conversation with Bruce Schiefelbein, former Officer Commanding EOD Squadron, JIRU, April 1, 2005.

⁹¹ Bert Schwarz, “Blown into proportion.” *Defender* XXI, no. 2 (2004), p. 12.

⁹² For example, the 2-week duration of the Air Force training compared with the 4 weeks of the DEFIEDD Course.

⁹³ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 53.

ADF's IEDD-related specializations.⁹⁴ To provide flexibility in the employment of IEDD operators, there was a need to standardize skills across the sub-unit. Standardization was achieved by adopting the DEFIEDD Course as the "entry" standard for IEDD training in the Squadron. Because not all personnel identified for service with the Squadron had taken the course, this required significant coordination and the conduct of additional courses at the RAAOC Centre in the first half of 2000.

The core of the Squadron's capability was the IEDD equipment held by the regional SATO offices. It was audited against a benchmark of "world's best practice" set by the Commanding Officer of the JIRU and was researched by EOD Squadron staff. Although arguably a higher benchmark than that used by the NSWPS for its IEDD capability, this benchmark was considered necessary because of the Games' strategic importance to Australia and because the Government's and public's expectations of the ADF were assessed to be high. The benchmarking activity included some specialized training in the United States by the Squadron Operations Officer in 1999 and a study tour of Canadian and U.S. IEDD capabilities in early 2000. The audit, conducted by EOD Squadron key staff in 1999, identified a number of deficiencies.⁹⁵ Some of these were the result of a deteriorating capability caused by lack of maintenance and attrition over time; others were the result of a dated benchmark for that capability, which did not reflect developments in the improvised explosive device threat. The full scope of these deficiencies, and their subsequent solutions, is classified, but they included replacing the Army's entire fleet of bomb suits, which had deteriorated to the point that their protective value could not be assured.⁹⁶ Funding to address these deficiencies was not provided within either current Army allocations or the scope of Project Bloodhound. Submissions for capability remediation submitted by the JIRU through HQ JTF 112 eventually secured the necessary funding through a combination of Army maintenance money and funds from the major capability program. These funds were applied to an increase in the scope of Project Bloodhound, which enabled the experienced Project Team to source the necessary equipment in time to remediate the capability before the Games.

The Squadron's principal equipment was concentrated at Holsworthy in July 2000, where it was technically inspected, serviced, and repaired as necessary.⁹⁷ Much of the equipment that arrived from the regional SATO offices was in a neglected state and could scarcely have been considered operational.⁹⁸ Squadron personnel assembled by late July in time to undertake a 4-week preparatory training package.⁹⁹ The purpose of this training was to establish skills currency, qualify personnel in the new equipment and techniques introduced as part of the capability remediation, and provide Games-specific training (such as geographic orientation to Sydney for out-of-town members).

⁹⁴ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 50.

⁹⁵ Personal conversation with Bruce Schiefelbein, former Officer Commanding EOD Squadron, JIRU, April 1, 2005.

⁹⁶ Personal conversation with Bruce Schiefelbein, former Officer Commanding EOD Squadron, JIRU, April 1, 2005.

⁹⁷ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 53.

⁹⁸ Personal conversation with Bruce Schiefelbein, former Officer Commanding EOD Squadron, JIRU, April 1, 2005.

⁹⁹ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, pp. 50, 53.

Training was completed by the end of August in time for the OSP. By the time the Squadron became operational, it represented a significant qualitative and quantitative improvement over the ADF's normal level of IEDD capability.

During the OSP, the Squadron's teams operated from Holsworthy and three FOBs located at police stations in the Sydney urban area. Some scarce and highly specialized equipment was also held at each base location for distribution to EOD teams if necessary for especially demanding tasks. The FOBs were shared with police IEDD teams and other capabilities. To ensure a seamless dispatch process for ADF IEDD teams without compromising ADF command authority, the EOD Squadron provided C2 personnel at the NSWPS Bomb Management Coordination Centre at the OPRO, as well as at Holsworthy and at each FOB. Doing so imposed a personnel overhead but offered important advantages in the control and visibility of ADF tasking and the coordination of intelligence and logistical support to operational elements. In addition to standard truck-mounted IEDD teams, the Squadron maintained a helicopter-deployable flyaway capability for response to otherwise inaccessible areas or short-notice support outside the Sydney area.

The EOD Squadron began to draw down in strength following the Summer Games because of a planned reduction in NSWPS support requirements for the Paralympics. Personnel began to be released back to parent units from early October. The Squadron disbanded in November 2000. Equipment that had been concentrated from SATO offices was returned, having been fully remediated to the notional operational standard that applied pre-Games. The CBRR Squadron retained new IEDD equipment procured for the OSP for safekeeping until its eventual disposal could be determined; distributing it to SATO offices was not an option because of a lack of ongoing training and maintenance support resulting from its rushed acquisition.

Clearance Diving

A composite Mine Clearance Diving Team drawn from the Royal Australian Navy's Mine Warfare and Clearance Diving Force Clearance provided diving support for the Games. A total of 95 CDs (equal to two Clearance Diving Teams) supported the Games.¹⁰⁰ The CDs provided an underwater HRS and IEDD capability for the NSWPS and interstate police services.¹⁰¹ The principal tasks undertaken by the team were underwater searches of vessels carrying VIPs or members of the "Olympic Family" who were entitled to special security support. Searches were also conducted of some marine Olympic venues, such as the triathlon swim leg course and the sailing marina.¹⁰²

Aviation Support

A Joint Aviation Group assembled from elements of the Army's 1st and 5th Aviation Regiments and the Navy's 817 Squadron Aviation provided support for the Games.¹⁰³ The aircraft types involved were Kiowa, Iroquois, Black Hawk, Chinook, and Sea King helicopters and King Air fixed-wing aircraft.¹⁰⁴ The principal tasks for the Aviation Group

¹⁰⁰ *Defence Annual Report 2000–01*, p. 104.

¹⁰¹ Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 81.

¹⁰² *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Security*, p. 5, available <http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/postgames/en/pg001500.htm>, viewed September 4, 2005.

¹⁰³ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 88. Also Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, pp. 86–92.

¹⁰⁴ *Defence Annual Report 2000–01*, pp. 100, 111.

were aeromedical evacuation, “contingency” support for Defence or civilian response elements, and support to the Special Forces TAG.¹⁰⁵ This support included an airlift capability for interstate response tasks. The Group utilized spare capacity to transport Defence personnel around the Sydney area. Most aircraft were based at RAAF Base Richmond,¹⁰⁶ with a few based at Holsworthy. Aircraft noise over urban areas was a constant and sensitive issue for the Aviation Group throughout the Games.

JTF 114

JTF 114, based on the Army’s Special Operations capabilities, provided high-end ADF CT support for the Games. The JTF included elements of the Special Air Services Regiment, 4th Battalion the Royal Australian Regiment (Commando), 5th Aviation Regiment, 10th Force Support Battalion, and No. 3 Airfield Defence Squadron (RAAF).¹⁰⁷ The JTF was based at Holsworthy, where special temporary facilities were constructed to provide TAG personnel with secure training areas so their highly perishable skills could be maintained over the OSP.

JTF elements underwent intensive, highly compressed preparation for the operation, which included elaborate helicopter assault exercises within the Sydney urban area. The support available to the NSWPS from JTF 114 covered the entire spectrum of Special Forces’ CT capabilities, including the newly developed SUR capability and the ability to conduct a hostage rescue assault in a CBR hazard environment; the latter required support from the CBRR Squadron of the JIRU.¹⁰⁸ Both SUR and CBR assault are examples of sophisticated capabilities that would have been beyond the resources of a civilian agency but that the ADF was able to develop reasonably quickly.

Assignment to JTF 114 effectively optimized the TAG for CT response coverage within the Sydney area. It required special management arrangements to ensure adequate coverage in the event of a non-Olympics-related incident.

Equipment Support

The NSWPS requested loans of ADF equipment to enable it to field additional resources during the Games. Most requests were related to bomb response equipment, such as water-column disruptors, which would have allowed additional bomb response teams to be deployed. Most requests were not met because the ADF needed all available equipment to meet its own surge requirements.

Training Support

ADF training support to civilian agencies in preparation for the Games focused largely on assisting those agencies in acquiring capabilities in the relatively new field of CBR response. Training support included the following:

- **CBR First Responder Training.** CBR first responder training was delivered to civilian police, fire, and ambulance services from all states. Training consisted of a 3-day course conducted by the Army’s School of Military Engineering (then known as Mobility and Survivability Wing of the Combat Arms Centre) at the School’s Moorebank (NSW) site. Attendance of state personnel was coordinated by Emergency Management Australia. The training was very much entry level, aimed at

¹⁰⁵ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 88.

¹⁰⁶ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 89.

¹⁰⁷ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 84.

¹⁰⁸ McPhedran, *The Amazing SAS*, p. 120.

familiarizing emergency services personnel with CBR hazards and the wearing of the Army's in-service nuclear, biological, and chemical protective ensemble. The intent of the training was to create awareness of the CBR dimension of emergency management and to establish a rudimentary level of capability that would enhance the effectiveness and survivability of CBR first responders.¹⁰⁹ In all, more than 300 NSW policemen and an unknown number of other emergency services personnel were trained.^{110, 111}

- **Bomb Technician CBR Awareness Course.** In the same way “normal” first responders might be the first emergency services personnel on the scene of a CBR incident, normal police Bomb Technicians might be the first to encounter a CBR device. The aim of the Bomb Technician CBR Awareness Course was to instill awareness of the CBR threat and the technical implications of a CBR device. A key objective was to enable police Bomb Technicians to recognize the indicators that a device or situation might contain a CBR hazard so they would request the appropriate specialist support (such as Fire Brigades HAZMAT and JIRU CBRR teams) and avoid applying conventional disposal techniques that might worsen a situation. The JIRU CBRR Squadron developed and taught the CBR Awareness Course to NSWPS and Australian Protective Services personnel at Holsworthy Barracks.

Intelligence Support

Defence support to Olympic intelligence efforts is difficult to gauge from open-source material, but some references indicate that Defence personnel were embedded in Olympics intelligence agencies. For example, JTF 112 included “personnel seconded to the Olympics Intelligence Centre, providing a link between police and national intelligence agencies.”¹¹² Closer to the Games, this link achieved an unprecedented closeness. The sense conveyed by conversations with personnel exposed to the intelligence arrangements is of a very effective level of coordination among all Australian intelligence agencies.¹¹³ The contribution of Defence agencies does not seem to be a dominant feature of Games’ intelligence measures; rather, these were a proportionate part in the whole-of-government intelligence effort.

Post-Games Situation

After the Games, JTFs 112 and 114 were disbanded and the associated resources mostly returned to their pre-Games use. Some new capabilities developed for the Games provided a residual capability for the ADO, however. These included the CBRR capability, which remained in a new CBRR Squadron and in a revitalized domestic preparedness capability within DSTO; and SUR, which the SASR retained.

Conclusion

Operation GOLD was a major ADO operation that contributed significantly to the successful conduct of the Sydney 2000 Games. Much of that contribution was in domestic security roles

¹⁰⁹ The term “first responder,” although common now, was relatively new in 1999. It recognizes the reality that the first emergency services personnel to respond to a security incident will most probably be “normal” police, fire or ambulance personnel with no specialized skills or capabilities (rather than sophisticated specialized capabilities, such as the JIRU).

¹¹⁰ Personal conversations (various) with Acting Inspector Mark Sowter, NSWPS, 1999–2000; personal conversation with Mr. Don Patterson, Emergency Management Australia, March 24, 2005.

¹¹¹ NSWFB, *Protecting the People's Games: New South Wales Fire Brigades Post-Olympics Report* Sydney: NSWFB, 2000, pp. 74–75.

¹¹² Defence. *Operation GOLD*. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001, p. 18.

¹¹³ Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Kelly, July 2005.

and involved capabilities similar to those normally possessed by state authorities. In general, Operation GOLD allowed the relevant civilian authorities, notably those of NSW, to surge to higher levels of capability than normally needed for day-to-day security requirements in order to meet the transient demands of the Games. In this regard, use of the ADO was an economical means of generating the necessary surge. The Operation was also a significant trigger for the development of new homeland security capabilities by the ADO. These included new capabilities in conventional CT, such as SUR, as well as an extensive investment in the novel field of CBRR—some of it sourced from overseas by exercising Defence contacts.¹¹⁴

In addition to providing the usual support at short notice, the 2000 Games stimulated the development of significant new ADF capabilities with specific application to homeland security. This capability needed to be acquired within the short timeframe of 18 months (an estimate derived from an indication given by Brigadier Philip McNamara in an address to the Royal United Services Institute of NSW early in 2000 and from the timing of the 1999 Budget announcement).¹¹⁵ This was a demanding task that likely only Defence could have met because of its personnel resources and in-house training, procurement, and research and development capacities.¹¹⁶

Operation GOLD involved an escalating commitment over 2 years from late 1998. It remains the largest single commitment of ADO resources for a domestic task in peacetime. Although its scale was unprecedented, it was nevertheless a traditional commitment in that it represented ADO support to civil authorities in a task that exceeded their resources. In that respect, Operation GOLD was like any other employment of the ADO on domestic support duties during peacetime. At the Operation's end, most of the additional capability established was dispersed, with only a residual CBRR capability being retained in an independent Squadron based at Holsworthy.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Brigadier Philip McNamara address to the Royal United Services Institute of NSW, 2000. Quoted in Martin Chulov and David Kennedy, "Games security revealed," *The Australian*, March 1, 2000.

¹¹⁵ Quoted in Martin Chulov and David Kennedy, "Games security revealed," *The Australian*, March 1, 2000.

¹¹⁶ Mr. Don Patterson, Assistant Director Special Operations, Emergency Management Australia, in an interview recorded March 24, 2005.

¹¹⁷ *The Australian Army in Profile 2000*, p. 81.

Appendix 2: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the 2002 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Operation GUARDIAN II)

Australia hosted the 2002 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM 2002) in Queensland over March 2–5, 2002. As a significant international event, conduct of CHOGM 2002 included a major protective security operation to which the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) contributed significant capabilities. Given the limited range of participants (heads of government of Commonwealth countries), CHOGM 2002 was a classic example of an Elite Participation Event. This study analyzes the ADO contribution to CHOGM 2002 as an example of a domestic event support operation for an Elite Participation Event in Australia *after* the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 (9/11).

Background

Australia was scheduled to host a CHOGM in Brisbane in October 2001. As a Commonwealth Government activity, the event was Commonwealth led and state supported. The Commonwealth naturally held primary responsibility for the coordination of the conference itself, but the conference's location in Queensland meant that security was coordinated jointly between the Queensland Police Service (QPS) and the Commonwealth.¹¹⁸ Planning for ADO support to the security effort began in 2000.

The ADO support for CHOGM 2001 was named Operation GUARDIAN.¹¹⁹ By May 2001, planning had developed to the point that a commitment of approximately 1,600 Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel was anticipated.¹²⁰ By this stage, ADF and QPS planning was well integrated; relationships between ADF and QPS planners had developed to the point that combined social events were conducted.¹²¹

The 9/11 terrorist attacks led to the postponement of CHOGM 2001 and the suspension of Operation GUARDIAN. The activity was rescheduled for March 2002 to be held in the Coolumb area of Queensland's Sunshine Coast. The ADO support activity was renamed Operation GUARDIAN II.¹²² As a result of this renaming, the previous operation has come to be referred to as GUARDIAN I.

Threat Environment

Operation GUARDIAN II was the first Australian protective security operation of the post-9/11 period. As a result, the threat level was elevated significantly from the level on which planning for GUARDIAN I was based. Comparing the composition of the GUARDIAN I and II force packages therefore offers a useful indication of the impact of the post-9/11 threat environment on ADO security support requirements. The conclusiveness of this comparison is limited, however, by the use of open-source data on force composition and capabilities.

¹¹⁸ "CHOGM 2001," Defence Media Release CPA 160/01, May 18, 2001.

¹¹⁹ *Defence Annual Report 2000–01*, p. 82.

¹²⁰ "CHOGM 2001," Defence Media Release, 2001. *Defence Annual Report 2000–01*, p. 82.

¹²¹ A "CHOGM Planning Unit Mixed Dining-In (Night)" was held at the Army's Gallipoli Barracks on May 18, 2001. This was attended by military and police commanders, planning staff, and their spouses. Photograph displayed in Headquarters 7th Brigade, Gallipoli Barracks, viewed June 30, 2006.

¹²² *Defence Annual Report 2001–02*, p. 75.

GUARDIAN I essentially anticipated a similar threat level to the 2000 Games; hence, the planned ADO support package was similar yet scaled back considerably because of the much smaller demands of CHOGM 2001. This difference in scale explains the difference between the 1,600-person ADO support requirement initially estimated for GUARDIAN and the 4,000 required for Operation GOLD.¹²³

9/11 significantly altered the threat environment for GUARDIAN II. This led to the selection of a more isolated venue (a resort area at Cooloom rather than the Brisbane urban area) and measures to address more sophisticated threats. The most significant new threat was the use of a civilian aircraft to attack the conference venue (the anthrax attacks executed through the U.S. Postal Service in late 2001 had also raised concern about chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear [CBRN] threats).

ADO Support to Operation GUARDIAN I

The ADO security support requirement for Operation GUARDIAN I consisted of a counterterrorist (CT) assault capability and bomb management resources, including operational and technical high risk search (THRS); explosive detection dogs; improvised explosive device disposal (IEDD); chemical, biological, and radiological response (CBRR); and underwater search.¹²⁴ The operational security elements therefore consisted of—

- Special Air Service Regiment Tactical Assault Group and supporting elements
- A CBRR element from the newly formed CBRR Squadron
- A THRS Squadron, based on a Combat Engineer Squadron from the 3rd Combat Engineer Regiment¹²⁵
- A substantial low risk search element drawn from the Brisbane-based 7th Brigade
- IEDD teams.

Training for specialist capabilities, such as operational search and THRS, drew heavily on recent Olympics experience. The THRS Squadron employed a training package developed by the Joint Incident Response Unit (JIRU) High Risk Search (HRS) Squadron, delivered by former HRS Squadron personnel, and drew on ex-HRS Squadron equipment maintained by the newly raised CBRR Squadron.¹²⁶ Operational search elements utilized the Operational Search Battalion (OSB) training package.

Operation GOLD experience also heavily influenced command and control (C2) arrangements. A Joint Task Force (JTF) Headquarters (HQ) based on HQ 7th Brigade was to command non-CT ADO support; CT support would be the responsibility of a Special Forces JTF. These organizations were similar in function to JTFs 112 and 114 during the Sydney Games.¹²⁷ ADO personnel also advocated QPS adoption of arrangements used successfully during the Sydney Games, such as the joint ADF-Police Bomb Management Coordination

¹²³ *Defence Annual Report 2000–01*, pp. 81–82.

¹²⁴ “The support arrangements will include ADF helicopter support, counterterrorist support similar to the Olympics, provision of specialist night observation and personal protective equipment, and specialist assistance with bomb search and disposal.” “CHOGM 2001,” Defence Media Release, 2001.

¹²⁵ Personal conversations with Lieutenant Colonel Russell Maddalena, Officer Commanding THRS Squadron for Operations GUARDIAN I and II, September 2005.

¹²⁶ Personal conversations with Lieutenant Colonel Russell Maddalena, Officer Commanding THRS Squadron for Operations GUARDIAN I and II, September 2005.

¹²⁷ Personal conversations with Lieutenant Colonel Russell Maddalena, Officer Commanding THRS Squadron for Operations GUARDIAN I and II, September 2005.

Centre.¹²⁸ In this regard, ADO was able to facilitate the migration of useful event security techniques across state boundaries.

ADO Support to Operation GUARDIAN II

The post-9/11 threat environment caused a significant addition to the ADO support package for GUARDIAN II in the defensive counter-air (DCA) capability provided by armed Royal Australian Air Force F/A-18 fighter aircraft that, at key times, were airborne in a combat air patrol.¹²⁹ Although only a limited number of airframes were involved, this was a considerable increase in the scale of ADO support because, to fully employ the F/A-18s, additional capabilities such as air-to-air refuelling and air defense radars would also have been needed.¹³⁰ The scale of additional resources can be gauged from those required to perform a similar task in support of U.S. President Bush's visit in October 2003. These included, in addition to eight F/A-18s, a Control and Reporting Unit, a Regional Correlation Centre, a Tactical Air Operations Centre, Air Command Liaison Officers, and ground support assets.¹³¹ The addition of DCA also raised legal issues in relation to the ADF's use of force for domestic security. This influenced subsequent legislation regulating the employment of the ADO in homeland security—most notably the statutory review of Part III AAA of the Defence Act.

The inclusion of DCA increased the complexity of ADO C2 arrangements for CHOGM 2002 through the addition of a further JTF HQ for air defense. This brought the total number of JTFs commanding ADF elements during CHOGM 2002 to three.¹³²

Early post-9/11 ADO capability adjustments affected support and C2 arrangements for GUARDIAN II. One such adjustment was the activation of the Incident Response Unit (IRU) to augment the ADO's chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear response (CBRNR) capability. CBRNR became a more important element of the CHOGM 2002 security package in the aftermath of the 2001 anthrax attacks in the United States. Senator Robert Hill, the Minister for Defence, drew specific attention to this capability in public statements.¹³³ This contrasts with media coverage of the CBRNR capability during Operation GOLD, in which CBRNR was rarely mentioned. The creation of the IRU added another unit HQ into the C2 mix for CHOGM 2002, but it also added depth to the employment of the CBRNR capability because an experienced lieutenant colonel—rather than a junior major—now represented that niche in the C2 process.

Other aspects of ADO support to GUARDIAN II remained essentially similar to those planned for GUARDIAN I. The total number of personnel increased by about 50 percent over

¹²⁸ Personal conversations with Lieutenant Colonel Russell Maddalena, Officer Commanding THRS Squadron for Operations GUARDIAN I and II, September 2005.

¹²⁹ *Defence Annual Report 2001–02*, p. 75.

¹³⁰ Senator Robert Hill, "Successful Defence Support to CHOGM," Ministerial Media Release MIN 87/02, March 5, 2002.

¹³¹ Senator Robert Hill, answer to Question No. 2322 (Senator Chris Evans), Senate Hansard, December 1, 2003, p. 18597.

¹³² "The ADF contribution will consist of three JTFs covering the areas of general support, counterterrorism support and air defence support." Senator Robert Hill, "Increased Air Security for CHOGM," Ministerial Media Release MIN 70/02, February 22, 2002.

¹³³ "Successful Defence Support to CHOGM," Ministerial Media Release MIN 87/02, March 5, 2002.

those forecast for the earlier Operation, however, totaling about 2,400.¹³⁴ Overall, heightened threat perceptions added a significant new dimension to the ADO's involvement.

Analysis of ADO Security Support to CHOGM 2002

ADO security support to CHOGM 2002 suggests a shift in the provision of special event security capabilities compared with practice during Operation GOLD. There was a significant reduction in the employment of *ad hoc* ADO elements and a move to using formed units and (relatively) mature capabilities. Whereas the JIRU and OSB were raised specifically for Operation GOLD, most capabilities planned for or employed in Operations GUARDIAN I and II were based on standing unit structures. THRS, for example, drew on existing training and equipment to convert a standing engineer sub-unit into a THRS capability. The establishment of the CBRR Squadron (and later the IRU) also meant that CBRR was an existing capability (albeit in some ways an embryonic one). Similarly, the security of JTF HQ was based on HQ 7th Brigade, rather than an *ad hoc* organization such as JTF 112.

This trend away from using *ad hoc* elements, in both capabilities and C2 practices, is largely attributable to the legacy of Operation GOLD. The similarity of many aspects of the GUARDIAN I support package to those provided for Operation GOLD could also indicate a tendency to benchmark security arrangements off those for the last operation conducted, especially if that operation was relatively recent.

The inclusion of DCA in the ADO support package and the local reaction to the U.S. anthrax attacks indicate a new readiness to factor overseas experience into Australian threat assessments. Evidence for this lies in a comment by the Australian Minister for Defence: "The post-9/11 reality is that we must be prepared to respond to any threat that may arise."¹³⁵

If the "last event benchmarking" tendency does exist, it could have a cumulative effect on the composition of defense establishment (DE) support packages. "Old" support requirements are unlikely to be removed until the states and territories can develop adequate capabilities of their own, but new ones could be added. Once again, Australian experience may be illustrative; after CHOGM 2002, DCA was included in the security arrangements for the visits of both the U.S. President and the Chinese Premier in October 2003, the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, APEC 2007, CHOGM 2011, and the visit of the U.S. President in November 2011.^{136, 137, 138, 139} In the post-9/11 environment, therefore, pressure to employ DE resources in support of major event security requirements is unlikely to decrease.

¹³⁴ Senator Robert Hill, "Increased Air Security for CHOGM," February 22, 2002; "Successful Defence Support to CHOGM," March 5, 2002.

¹³⁵ Senator Robert Hill, "Increased Air Security for CHOGM," February 22, 2002.

¹³⁶ Senator Robert Hill, answer to Question No. 2322, December 1, 2003; AAP, "Games security plan unveiled," September 20, 2005, available <http://www.news.com.au/story/print/0,10119,16662566,00.html>, viewed September 20, 2005.

¹³⁷ Defence Media Release October 20, 2011 "Hornets heading to Perth in support of CHOGM," available at <http://news.defence.gov.au/2011/10/20/hornets-heading-to-perth-in-support-of-chogm/>, viewed January 12, 2012.

¹³⁸ Defence Media Release November 14, 2011: "ADF Support to the US Presidents Visit," available at <http://news.defence.gov.au/2011/11/14/adf-support-to-the-us-president%e2%80%99s-visit/>, viewed January 12, 2012.

¹³⁹ Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, House of Representatives *Votes and Proceedings*, No. 82, November 23 2011, Canberra, 2011, p. 1132.

Appendix 3: Case Study: Australian Defence Organisation Support to the Conduct of the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games (Operation ACOLYTE)

The Australian city of Melbourne hosted the 2006 Commonwealth Games in March 2006. Like the Sydney 2000 Games and Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) 2002, the conduct of the Melbourne 2006 Games included a major protective security operation to which the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) was a significant contributor. Like the Sydney 2000 Games, the ADO also provided significant general (non-security) support. This case study analyzes the ADO's contribution to the Melbourne 2006 Games as an example of a post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) domestic event support operation for a Public Participation Event in Australia.

Background

On October 10, 1999, the Commonwealth Games Federation General Assembly announced that Melbourne would host the 2006 Commonwealth Games.¹⁴⁰ Melbourne's organizing role meant the Games would be a state-led, Commonwealth-supported activity. As it had done for the Sydney 2000 Games, the Federal Government anticipated that the security of the Games would require a significant, extraordinary contribution from Defence.¹⁴¹ The Minister for Defence acknowledged this on May 11, 2004, and again later that year.¹⁴²

ADO support to the Games—named Operation ACOLYTE—eventually involved about 2,600 personnel in a range of security and non-security roles.¹⁴³ Operation ACOLYTE commenced in January 2005, but the Operation's name was not announced publicly until late that year.¹⁴⁴ Because of its recency, official reports on Operation ACOLYTE were not available at the time of writing. The information contained in this case study was obtained from open-source material to the greatest extent possible and supplemented by personal conversations and observations as a participant. Because some of the ADO capabilities employed in Operation ACOLYTE are similar to those used in Operations GOLD and GUARDIAN, they are not explained further here except to the extent that they differed from their earlier manifestations.

Operation ACOLYTE

Operation ACOLYTE was the largest ADO operation mounted in support of an Australian domestic event since Operation GOLD in 2000; hence, it was also the largest since 9/11. Like Operation GOLD, a large part of the support provided was security related. Operation ACOLYTE, therefore, enables a useful comparison of pre- and post-9/11 employment of the ADO in homeland security roles. The selection of the name "ACOLYTE" was significant in

¹⁴⁰ "Bidding to Host the Commonwealth Games" available

<http://www.commonwealthgames.org.au/GamesInfo/General/Bidding.htm>, viewed May 1, 2006.

¹⁴¹ The Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games quickly came to be referred to as "M2006" in Australian and Victorian Government circles. Confusingly, this was also the shorthand title for the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games Corporation (M2006 Corporation), which was established in 2002 by the Victorian Government to organize the staging of the Games. "Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games," available http://www.ag.gov.au/agd/WWW/protectivesecurityHome.nsf/Page/Commonwealth_Games_2006, accessed May 1, 2006.

¹⁴² Robert Hill, "Ministerial Media Release Min84/04—Commonwealth Games Security," Canberra: Department of Defence, 2004. Also *Winning in Peace, Winning in War 2004*, p. 13.

¹⁴³ "Operation ACOLYTE," Department of Defence official Web site, available <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>, viewed May 1, 2006.

¹⁴⁴ *Defence Annual Report 2004–05*, Canberra: Department of Defence, 2005, Chapter 4, Outcome One.

itself: meaning “assistant,” the name was intended to emphasize the ADO’s supporting role in the event.¹⁴⁵

Non-Security Support

The non-security support provided under Operation ACOLYTE was less than that provided for the Sydney 2000 Games. This was a deliberate policy decision to minimize the ADO’s “general” support liability.¹⁴⁶ Although general support was not directly relevant to homeland security, some peripheral implications are worthy of note.

The significant contrast between the extensive ADO involvement in general support for the Sydney 2000 Games and the much more conservative approach adopted for Melbourne 2006 is evidence of strain on ADO resources in the post-9/11 world. Although not so stated in open-source material, it is likely that the minimization of general support was a force preservation measure intended to reduce the demand on Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel at a time of high operational tempo resulting from the ADF’s commitments to overseas operations.

The general support provided included ceremonial and communications functions and the use of facilities.¹⁴⁷ Decisions to provide general support were made generally for three reasons. First, support was provided that was assessed to have positive public relations value. For example, the ADF bands based in Melbourne provided musical support to the Games’ Cultural Festival. Second, support was provided that offered operational or training benefits for the ADF. For example, the provision of Venue Communications Coordinators offered good training value for ADF personnel. Finally, general support in the form of access to Defence facilities was provided to offset requests for more personnel-intensive forms of support. For example, providing access to ADF facilities at Laverton for the conduct of Games ceremony rehearsals afforded a unique advantage to the Games organizers that was highly valued and appreciated—to the extent that requests for other forms of support could be resisted.¹⁴⁸ Some non-security assistance, especially when it “saved the day” in situations where Games organizers had few alternative sources for that support, helped maintain good working relationships between the ADF and other Games agencies. Those relationships were key to the successful delivery of Defence support in the more important security areas.¹⁴⁹

The ADO’s Responsibilities

Australia’s normal constitutional arrangements gave primary responsibility for the security of the Games to the State of Victoria. With the exception of the Queen’s Baton Relay (the Commonwealth Games’ equivalent to the Olympic Torch Relay), which traveled throughout Australia, the other states only incurred a Games-related security liability if they hosted preparing international teams. As for the Sydney 2000 Games, Defence, as part of the Federal Government, technically was in a supporting role in all of these efforts. Accordingly, Defence could contribute to Games security only in response to requests from Victoria for assistance in areas in which state resources or capabilities were inadequate.

¹⁴⁵ “Operation ACOLYTE,” Department of Defence official Web site, available <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>, viewed May 1, 2006.

¹⁴⁶ Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Annett, Deputy Commander JTF 636 and Operation ACOLYTE, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

¹⁴⁷ Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston, “Moving Forward,” *Defence*, April 2006, p. 7.

¹⁴⁸ Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Annett, Deputy Commander JTF 636 and Operation ACOLYTE, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

¹⁴⁹ Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Annett, Deputy Commander JTF 636 and Operation ACOLYTE, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

Planning

Detailed ADO planning for the 2006 Commonwealth Games began in 2003—almost 4 years after Melbourne was announced as the host city.¹⁵⁰ A small, strategic-level planning effort was maintained within Strategic Operations Division in Canberra from late 2003, which began to shape Defence involvement. A concept of operations for Defence support was developed by mid-2004, which saw the majority of that support being delivered through a Joint Task Force (JTF). This JTF was numbered JTF 636 in accordance with the conventional numbering system for JTFs.¹⁵¹ A Forward Command Element (FCE) for JTF 636 was established in Melbourne from January 2005 to continue detailed planning with Games organizing agencies, notably the Melbourne 2006 Corporation (M2006), Office of Commonwealth Games Coordination, and Victoria Police.¹⁵²

Threat Environment

Operation ACOLYTE was the fourth ADO protective security operation in support of a domestic event since 9/11—the others being Operation GUARDIAN II (CHOGM 2002), Operation SCRUMMAGE (Rugby World Cup 2003), and Operation MIATA (the separate, but almost concurrent, visits of Presidents Bush and Hu in late 2003). Considerable experience had therefore accumulated in the conduct of international events in the post-9/11 threat environment. Both CHOGM and the Commonwealth Games were conducted under the same “medium” level of assessed threat—meaning an attack on the event was “feasible and could well occur.”^{153, 154} In contrast with CHOGM, however, the Commonwealth Games were a Public Participation Event. The Games’ security requirements, therefore, were different from those of CHOGM, but this did not translate into proportionately larger ADO involvement.

ADO Support to the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games

The ADO security support requirement for Operation ACOLYTE consisted of a counterterrorist (CT) assault capability, maritime CT and defensive counter-air (DCA) capabilities, and bomb management resources, including operational and technical high risk search (THRS); explosive detection dogs (EDD); improvised explosive device disposal (IEDD); chemical, biological, and radiological response (CBRR); and underwater search.¹⁵⁵ The operational security elements therefore consisted of—

- A Special Forces Task Group consisting of—
 - A Tactical Assault Group (TAG) drawn from the newly raised 4th Battalion, the Royal Australian Regiment (Commando) and supporting elements

¹⁵⁰ “Operation ACOLYTE,” Department of Defence official Web site, available <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>, viewed May 1, 2006.

¹⁵¹ Cameron Jamieson, *Games Success*, Defence, 2006. Available from <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte/news/article001/index.htm>, viewed May 1, 2006.

¹⁵² Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Annett, Deputy Commander JTF 636 and Operation ACOLYTE, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

¹⁵³ Personal conversation with Commander Brendan Bannan, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

¹⁵⁴ Paul O’Sullivan, “Challenges of Australia’s Security Environment.” Canberra: Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, 2006.

¹⁵⁵ These data were obtained from the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts official Commonwealth Games Web site: specifically from *Defence Support*, available http://www.m2006.dcita.gov.au/lib/pdf/15_defence.pdf, viewed June 28, 2006. Also *ACOLYTE Accolades* (Operation ACOLYTE newsletter), Editions 1–4, February–March 2006, provided to the author by the Department of Defence; and Trevor Grant, “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Australia: Department of Defence, 2006.

- A CBRR Squadron from the Incident Response Regiment (IRR)
 - A Special Forces Aviation Element (171st Aviation Squadron) equipped with Black Hawk helicopters¹⁵⁶
- An Engineer Task Group (ETG) based on the Headquarters (HQ) of the 3rd Combat Engineer Regiment (3 CER) and consisting of—
 - A THRS Squadron based on a Combat Engineer Squadron from 3 CER
 - An Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Troop providing IEDD teams on a similar model to the JIRU teams for Operation GOLD
 - An EDD Troop
- A Security Task Group (STG) providing a substantial low risk (“operational”) search capability. This was drawn largely from Regular Army units in Brisbane, Army Reserve Response Force (RRF) elements from Sydney and Melbourne, and Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) Reserve units Australia-wide¹⁵⁷
- An Underwater Task Group consisting of Clearance Divers and a mine hunter coastal, HMAS¹⁵⁸ *Norman*¹⁵⁹
- A Maritime Task Group consisting of the amphibious landing platform ship HMAS *Manoora* and the ANZAC frigate HMAS *Warramunga*. These ships also supported the ship underway recovery capability provided by the Special Forces Task Group¹⁶⁰
- An Air Task Group provided by the RAAF consisting of F/A18 Hornet aircraft, air-to-air refuelers, and a deployable radar.¹⁶¹

This operational support was enabled by a Logistics Task Group drawn from Army Reserve logistics units and by a Military Police Task Group drawn from the Army’s 1st Military Police Battalion. General support was provided by a Ceremonial and General Support Task Group consisting of a composite ADF band (for musical support) and a team involved with training civilian volunteers in the conduct of Games flag-raising ceremonies.¹⁶² Unlike Operation GOLD, there was no general support aviation capability and there was only a small capacity for the internal “command and liaison” flying needs of the JTF itself. This was provided by a detachment of Army UH-1Hs and a single Navy Sea King helicopter, normally embarked on HMAS *Manoora*.

Operation ACOLYTE involved 2,600 ADO personnel,¹⁶³ who were accommodated at ADF establishments within Victoria or onboard Navy ships. The draw-down of permanent ADF numbers in Victoria since the mid-1990s meant that accommodation capacity had run down well below that required for Operation ACOLYTE and needed to be regenerated. In some

¹⁵⁶ “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Australia: Department of Defence, 2006.

¹⁵⁷ *Defence Support*, Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, available http://www.m2006.dcita.gov.au/lib/pdf/15_defence.pdf, viewed June 28, 2006.

¹⁵⁸ Her Majesty’s Australian Ship—the formal designation for Australian naval vessels.

¹⁵⁹ “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006.

¹⁶⁰ “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006.

¹⁶¹ “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006.

¹⁶² “Operation ACOLYTE,” Department of Defence official Web site, available <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>, viewed May 1, 2006. Also *ACOLYTE Accolades* (Operation ACOLYTE newsletter), Editions 1–4, February–March 2006; and “Operation ACOLYTE” (official film record) Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006.

¹⁶³ “Operation ACOLYTE,” Department of Defence official Web site, available <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>, viewed May 1, 2006.

cases, JTF 636 needed to negotiate access to former ADO properties that had been disposed of in the draw-down in order to base its elements.¹⁶⁴

Of the ADO elements providing security, all except the STG and the THRS and IEDD elements of the ETG were based on standing ADF capabilities. The ETG and STG elements were established specifically for Operation ACOLYTE by re-training ADF personnel for new roles. Training for the THRS capability drew heavily on experience from Operations GOLD and GUARDIAN and on the small THRS capability maintained by the IRR. New equipment was purchased to establish the capability and training began in late 2005. The EOD Troop utilized personnel with existing IEDD skills, but these and their equipment needed to be concentrated and trained in much the same way as the EOD Squadron of the JIRU. The low risk search capability provided by the STG drew on training developed for the RRFs, but additional equipment was also required to establish that capability.

Command and control (C2) arrangements differed from previous operations in that a single JTF HQ commanded all ADO support (CT, non-CT security, air and maritime, and general support). ADO personnel were not integrated into state police planning or C2 arrangements to the same extent as in previous operations, but a Bomb Management Coordination Centre concept was eventually accepted.¹⁶⁵

Legal Aspects

Operation ACOLYTE was the first domestic security support operation conducted by the ADO after the passage of the 2006 legislation amending Part IIIAAA of the Defence Act. This legislation was utilized to authorize DCA actions by the F/A18s in “specified circumstances.”¹⁶⁶ The new legislation, with its DCA provisions, received Royal assent on March 1, 2006.¹⁶⁷ A report on the authorization of the use of the ADF for DCA during the Commonwealth Games was tabled in the House of Representatives on March 30, 2006.¹⁶⁸ This short interval between the passage of the amendment legislation and its first use suggests that the impending Games were a stimulus for the passage of that legislation.

Analysis of ADO Security Support to the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games

When compared with Operations GOLD and GUARDIAN, ADO security support to the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games shows continuing evolution in Defence’s provision of special event security capabilities. The overall suite of security support was essentially the same as that provided for Operation GUARDIAN, with the major new development (DCA) being retained. This suggests that DCA has become part of “the cost of doing business” when hosting major international events in the current threat environment. As with earlier operations, some of the ADO support provided (such as the TAG, search, IEDD, and EDD) enabled the host jurisdiction to surge temporarily to higher levels of capability than normally maintained.

¹⁶⁴ Personal conversation with Colonel Michael Annett, Deputy Commander JTF 636 and Operation ACOLYTE, Melbourne, April 12, 2005.

¹⁶⁵ Personal conversation with Major Craig Madden, J3-3, Headquarters JTF 636, March 25, 2006.

¹⁶⁶ Brendan Nelson, “Australian Government Strengthens Defence Legislation,” Ministerial Media Release Min 011/2006, Canberra: Department of Defence, February 13, 2006.

¹⁶⁷ “Defence Legislation Amendment (Aid to Civilian Authorities) Act 2006.”

¹⁶⁸ “Defence Act Order 2006 Report on utilisation of the Defence Force in accordance with section 51X of the Defence Act 1903 in relation to Operation ACOLYTE defensive counter-air support to the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, March 27.” *Votes and Proceedings*, Canberra: Parliament of Australia, March 30, 2006.

The reduced employment of *ad hoc* ADO elements observed in Operation GUARDIAN also generally continued in Operation ACOLYTE. The significant reorganization required to raise and train the ETG and the STG, however, meant those organizations were, effectively, *ad hoc* structures. The STG did, however, take advantage of the “standing” Army Reserve RRFs. Significantly, the RRFs are a post-9/11 homeland security initiative. Most other task groups were based on standing organizations. The FCE of the JTF HQ was essentially *ad hoc*, but it was augmented from HQ 7th Brigade (a standing organization) to become the full JTF HQ for the major Games operational period of January–March 2006.

The most significant new development in the conduct of Operation ACOLYTE was the decision to command the operation through a single JTF rather than by multiple functional JTFs (non-CT security, CT, air, maritime, etc.). In this regard, the C2 model was consistent with that adopted in conventional military operations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Government material from electronic sources is listed against the originating government agency and is not reflected separately under “electronic sources.” Statements and documents by individuals acting in a Ministerial or official capacity are listed as government material under the appropriate agency.

Books, Occasional and Working Papers, Monographs, and Theses

McPhedran, Ian. *The Amazing SAS*. Sydney: Harper Collins, 2005.

Ryder, Chris. *A Special Kind of Courage: 321 EOD Squadron—Battling the Bombers*. London: Methuen, 2005.

Thompson, Alan. “Working Paper No. 23: Management of Australia’s Counter-Terrorism Program.” Canberra: Australian Defence Studies Centre, 1994.

Thompson, Alan (ed.). *Terrorism and the 2000 Olympics*, Canberra: Australian Defence Studies Centre, 1996.

Journal Articles

Department of Defence. “The Incident Response Regiment.” *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 20, no. 2 (2005): pp. 18–19.

Schwarz, Bert. “Blown into proportion.” *Defender* XXI, no. 2 (2004), Canberra, Australian Defence Association, p. 2.

Schwarz, Bert. “New task force faces biggest killer.” *Defender* XXIII, no. 3 (2006), Canberra, Australian Defence Association, pp. 32–33.

General Electronic Sources

Australian Commonwealth Games Association. “Bidding to Host the Commonwealth Game” (cited May 1, 2000). Available from

<http://www.commonwealthgames.org.au/GamesInfo/General/Bidding.htm>

Parker, George and James Blitz. “MoD Concerned over bigger Olympics role,” *Financial Times*, July 17, 2011, available from <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/0/2c807850-b07a-11e0-a5a7-00144feab492.html>

Sydney 2000 Corporation. *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad* (Various Volumes)—Available from <http://www.games.info.com.au/postgames/en/pgooo748.htm>

Australian Commonwealth Government Sources

Attorney General’s Department

Protective Security Coordination Centre Web site, 2006 (cited January 17, 2006). Available from

http://www.crimeprevention.gov.au/agd/WWW/protectivesecurityhome.nsf/Page/Latest_News

Australian National Audit Office

Commonwealth Agencies' Security Preparations for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games, 1998 (cited August 8, 2005). Available from <http://www.anao.gov.au/WebSite.nsf/Publications>

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation

O'Sullivan, Paul. "Challenges of Australia's Security Environment." Canberra: Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, 2006.

Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

"Defence Support," 2006 (cited June 28, 2006). Available from http://www.m2006.dcita.gov.au/lib/pdf/15_defence.pdf

Department of Defence

Policy documents

Defending Australia. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1994.

Winning in Peace, Winning in War. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2004.

Defence Force doctrine and training

"Royal Australian Air Force Improvised Explosive Device Operator Course: Block Syllabus." Sydney: Department of Defence, 1999.

Departmental and Ministerial announcements, statements, and media releases

"Defence Media Release CPA 160/01: CHOGM 2001." Canberra: Department of Defence, May 18, 2001.

Defence Media Release October 20, 2011: "Hornets heading to Perth in support of CHOGM," available at <http://news.defence.gov.au/2011/10/20/hornets-heading-to-perth-in-support-of-chogm/>, viewed January 12, 2012.

Defence Media Release November 14, 2011: "ADF Support to the US Presidents Visit," available at <http://news.defence.gov.au/2011/11/14/adf-support-to-the-us-president%e2%80%99s-visit/>, viewed January 12, 2012.

Hill, Robert. "Ministerial Media Release MIN 87/02: Successful Defence Support to CHOGM." Canberra: Department of Defence, 2002.

Hill, Robert. "Ministerial Media Release No. 70/02: Increased Air Security for CHOGM." Canberra: Department of Defence, 2002.

Hill, Robert. "Ministerial Media Release No. MIN 84/04: Commonwealth Games Security." Canberra: Department of Defence, 2004.

Hill, Robert. "Senate Hansard: Response to Question No. 2322." 18579. Canberra: Parliament of Australia, 2003.

Moore, John and Daryl Williams. "Joint Media Release MIN 051/00: Olympic Games Security." Canberra: Department of Defence/Attorney General's Department, March 16, 2000 (cited August 20, 2005).

Nelson, Brendan. "Ministerial Media Release 011/2006: Australian Government Strengthens Defence Legislation." Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006.

Reports and proceedings

"*Defence Report 1982–1983.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1983.

"*Defence Report 1983–1984.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1984.

"*Defence Report 1985–1986.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1986.

"*Defence Report 1986–1987.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1987.

"*Defence Report 1988–1989.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1989.

"*Defence Report 1992–1993.*" Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1993.

"*Defence Annual Report 2000–01.*" Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001.

"*Defence Annual Report 2001–02.*" Canberra: Department of Defence, 2002.

"*Defence Annual Report 2004–05.*" Canberra: Department of Defence, 2005.

Internal media, newspapers, and periodicals

"Defence launches new unit." *Jirumours* 1, no. 1 (1999).

"Operational Support Squadron." *Jirumours* 1, no. 3 (1999).

"Photos." *Jirumours* 2, no. 5 (2000): pp. 3–4.

"Photos." *Jirumours* 2, no. 6 (2000): p. 5.

“Photos.” *Jirumours* 2, no. 7 (2000): p. 5.

Grant, Trevor. “Operation ACOLYTE.” (Commemorative DVD). Australia: Department of Defence, 2006.

Houston, Angus. “Moving Forward,” *Defence*, April 2006, p. 7.

Jamieson, Cameron. *Games Success*, Melbourne: Department of Defence (Operation ACOLYTE Web site) 2006 (cited May 1, 2006). Available from <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte/news/article001/index.htm>

Unattributed article. “Police partnership.” *Army* 999, April 13, 2000, p. 7.

General Defence sources

The Army in Profile 1997. Canberra: Department of Defence, 1998.

The Australian Army in Profile 2000. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001.

JIRU Scrapbook. Sydney, Joint Incident Response Unit, 2000.

Operation ACOLYTE, Canberra: Department of Defence, 2006 (cited May 1, 2006). Available from <http://www.defence.gov.au/opacolyte>

Operation GOLD. Canberra: Department of Defence, 2001.

Operation GOLD—Joint Task Force 112 Handbook. Sydney: Department of Defence, 2000.

Parliamentary Documents

Papers, reports, and proceedings

Budget Paper No. 2 1999 (prepared by the Treasury) Canberra: Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1999 (cited August 20, 2005). Available from http://www.budget.gov.au/1999%2D00/bp2/bp2full_pdf.pdf

Budget Speech 1999 (prepared by the Treasury, delivered by Peter Costello) Canberra: Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1999.

“Defence Act Order 2006 Report on utilisation of the Defence Force in accordance with section 51X of the Defence Act 1903 in relation to Operation ACOLYTE defensive counter-air support to the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, March 27.” Canberra: Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 2006.

House of Representatives *Votes and Proceedings*, No. 82, November 23, 2011, Canberra: Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 2011.

Legislation

Defence Legislation Amendment (Aid to Civilian Authorities) Act 2006.

Australian State and Territory Government Sources

New South Wales Fire Brigades. *Protecting the People's Games: New South Wales Fire Brigades Post-Olympics Report*, Sydney: New South Wales Fire Brigades, 2000.

International Government Sources

Canadian Department of National Defence, *Defence Research and Development—Canada*, 2005 (cited August 15, 2005). Available from http://www.suffield.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/TesearchTech/Products/CB_PRODUCTS/RD950

Headquarters Department of the Army/U.S. Marine Corps, FM 100-19/FMFM 7-10, *Domestic Support Operations*, 1993, available http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/service_pubs/fm100_19.pdf, viewed August 14, 2011.

Newspaper, Magazine, and Internet Media Articles

Australian Associated Press, "Games security plan unveiled," September 20, 2005. Available from <http://www.news.com.au/story/print/0,10119,16662566,00.html>, viewed September 20, 2005.

Chulov, Martin and David Kennedy. "Games security revealed," *The Australian*, 2000.

Edwards, Rod. "Aussies visit Suffield." *Medicine Hat News*, April 10, 2000, p. 2.

McPhedran, Ian. "Games counter-terrorism costs \$23m." *The Courier Mail*, May 12, 1999, p. 33.

Unattributed article. "The D'Hage Code." *The Bulletin*, September 6, 2005, p. 67.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

9/11	The terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001
ADF	Australian Defence Force
ADO	Australian Defence Organisation
ANZAC	Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (in this paper, the designation of a class of frigates used by the Royal Australian and Royal New Zealand Navies)
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (Forum)
AT	Ammunition Technician
ATO	Ammunition Technical Officer
C2	Command and control
CBR	Chemical, biological, and radiological
CBRN	Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear
CBRNE	Chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield explosive
CBRNR	Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear response
CBRR	Chemical, biological, and radiological response
CD	Clearance Diver
CER	Combat Engineer Regiment
CHOGM	Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting
CM	Consequence management
CT	Counterterrorism, counterterrorist
DCA	Defensive counter-air
DE	Defense establishment (generically, referring to the entire government defense apparatus of a country, including its Ministry or Department of Defense/Defence, and its military forces, but excluding its private-sector defense industrial base)
DEFIEDD	Defence Improvised Explosive Device Disposal (Course)
DESO	Domestic event support operation
DSTO	Defence Science and Technology Organisation
EDD	Explosive detection dog
EOD	Explosive ordnance disposal
ETG	Engineer Task Group
FCE	Forward Command Element
FOB	Forward operating base
HAZMAT	Hazardous materials
HMAS	Her Majesty's Australian Ship
HQ	Headquarters
HQAST	Headquarters Australian Theatre
HRS	High risk search
IEDD	Improvised explosive device disposal
INTERFET	International Force in East Timor
IO	Information operations
IRR	Incident Response Regiment
IRU	Incident Response Unit
JIRU	Joint Incident Response Unit
JTF	Joint Task Force
LRS	Low risk search
M2006	Melbourne 2006 Corporation
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NBCD	Nuclear, biological, and chemical defense
NSW	New South Wales
NSWPS	New South Wales Police Service
OPRO	Olympics Precinct and Regional Operations (Centre)
ORTA	Olympics Road Transport Authority
OSB	Operational Search Battalion
OSP	Olympics security period
PSCC	(Initially) Australian Commonwealth Government's Protective Services Coordination Committee, later changed to Protective <i>Security</i> Coordination <i>Centre</i>
QPS	Queensland Police Service
RAAF	Royal Australian Air Force
RAAOC	Royal Australian Army Ordnance Corps
RAE	Royal Australian Engineers
RAN	Royal Australian Navy
RE	Royal Engineers (British Army)
RPD	Remote positioning device
RRF	Reserve Response Force
SASR	Special Air Service Regiment
SATO	Senior Ammunition Technical Officer
SOCOG	Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games
STG	Security Task Group
SUR	Ship underway recovery
TAG	Tactical Assault Group
THRS	Technical high risk search
TSS	Technical specialist search
TSSG	Technical and Scientific Support Group (of JIRU)
UK	United Kingdom
UWTG	Underwater Task Group
VIP	Very important person
WMD	Weapon(s) of mass destruction